

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9859

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 12, 1954

Mr. DONDERO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

4 SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of
5 rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood
6 control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and author-
7 ized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary
8 of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in
9 accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions

1 recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective
2 reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provi-
3 sions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved
4 March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Con-
5 gress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects
6 authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth
7 with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of
8 improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
9 tion and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein
10 set forth in full:

11 Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered
12 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

13 Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and
14 New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-
15 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

16 Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash
19 the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the
20 Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently
21 estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

22 Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$4,400,000;

25 Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document

1 Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$525,000;

3 Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
4 bered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$375,000;

6 Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document
7 Numbered 405, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$694,000;

9 Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document
10 Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$166,400;

12 Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Num-
13 bered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in
15 cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently
16 estimated as \$23,000;

17 Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Num-
18 bered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$135,000;

20 Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut:
21 House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$112,500;

23 Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$32,200;

1 Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered
2 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$31,928,000;

4 Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House
5 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an
6 estimated cost of \$138,000;

7 Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document
8 Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$1,973,900;

10 Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Num-
11 bered 229, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$469,400;

13 Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake
14 Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered
15 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,-
16 000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution
17 for the construction of all bridges, including approaches
18 thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard
19 heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

20 Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document
21 Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
22 of \$31,900;

23 Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Mary-
24 land: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

1 Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland:
2 House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$29,000;

4 Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland:
5 House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at
6 an estimated cost of \$192,600;

7 Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House
8 Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
9 mated cost of \$20,300;

10 Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Num-
11 bered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required
13 of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs
14 between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

15 Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland:
16 House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$45,100;

18 Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Num-
19 bered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$678,300;

21 Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay,
22 Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second
23 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

24 Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered
25 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

1 Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia:
2 Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

4 Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Docu-
5 ment Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
6 cost of \$95,000;

7 Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered
8 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

9 Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina:
10 House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$108,000;

12 Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Num-
13 bered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$102,000;

15 Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson
16 Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411,
17 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

18 Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Water-
19 way: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Con-
20 gress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

21 Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina:
22 House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at
23 an estimated cost of \$765,000;

1 Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered
2 110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;

3 Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Docu-
4 ment Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
5 mated cost of \$82,200;

6 Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered
7 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;

8 Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
9 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
10 \$98,000;

11 Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George
12 Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second
13 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

14 St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
15 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$1,312,000;

17 Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered
18 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$5,778,000;

20 Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Num-
21 bered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$70,000;

23 Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Docu-

1 ment Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$520,000;

3 Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document
4 Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
5 of \$6,875,000;

6 Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document
7 Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$74,300;

9 Aransas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intra-
10 coastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

12 Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

14 Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House
15 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already per-
17 formed by local interests on this project, in accordance with
18 recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribu-
19 tion required of local interests;

20 Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
22 mated cost of \$82,600;

23 Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document
24 Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$65,000;

1 Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House
2 Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
3 mated cost of \$142,000;

4 Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate
5 Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a
6 monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of
7 the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document
8 Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland
9 River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", au-
10 thorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is
11 hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment
12 of the project hereby approved;

13 Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Docu-
14 ment Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
15 cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system
16 work;

17 Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document
18 Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional esti-
19 mated cost of \$219,900;

20 Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Num-
21 bered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$220,000;

23 Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document

1 Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$217,200;

3 Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Num-
4 bered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25
6 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to
7 exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required
8 by the project document;

9 Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Docu-
10 ment Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
11 mated cost of \$225,000;

12 Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

14 Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Num-
15 bered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$174,000;

17 Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New
18 York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Con-
19 gress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

20 Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New
21 York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Con-
22 gress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;

23 Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$2,459,000;

1 Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California:
2 House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress,
3 at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secre-
4 tary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local
5 interests for such work as they may have done upon this
6 project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests
7 insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers and found to have been done in accordance with the
9 project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such re-
10 imbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable
11 thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take pre-
12 cedence over other pending projects of higher priority for
13 harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such
14 payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

15 Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California:
16 House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress:
17 *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of
18 entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and cen-
19 tral basin recommended in the project report and presently
20 estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum
21 of the cost thereof;

22 Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered
23 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$5,437,000;

25 Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate

1 Document Numbered 83, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
2 mated cost of \$3,758,700;

3 Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reeds-
4 port, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-
5 first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

6 Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington:
7 House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

9 Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the
10 head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

12 Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washing-
13 ton: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Con-
14 gress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

15 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House
16 Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
17 mated cost of \$421,800;

18 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Break-
19 water), Washington: House Document Numbered —,
20 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$323,700;

21 Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Num-
22 bered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
23 \$179,300;

24 Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered

1 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
2 \$139,250;

3 Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document
4 Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
5 cost of \$1,366,650;

6 Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Num-
7 bered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
8 \$436,000;

9 Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document
10 Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$3,397,300;

12 Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document
13 Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$477,900;

15 Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington:
16 House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$395,500;

18 Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Num-
19 bered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$425,550;

21 Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
22 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

23 Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
24 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

1 Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$3,022,000;

4 BEACH EROSION

5 Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document
6 Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
7 of \$140,000;

8 Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
9 Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
10 of \$189,000;

11 Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
12 bered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$402,900;

14 Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
15 Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
16 cost of \$409,000;

17 South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document
18 Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$166,550;

20 Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecti-
21 cut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress,
22 at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach;
23 \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

24 New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3),

1 Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect
3 Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf
4 Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

5 Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut:
6 House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at
7 an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000
8 for Seaside Park;

9 Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
10 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
11 \$2,044,000;

12 Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
13 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$105,000;

15 Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey:
16 House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$260,000;

18 Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered
19 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

20 Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered
21 380, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

22 Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Num-
23 bered 28, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$1,176,400;

1 Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$185,000;

4 Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Num-
5 bered 502, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
6 \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White
7 City Park;

8 Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House
9 Document Numbered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an
10 estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

11 Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York:
12 House Document Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at
13 an estimated cost of \$136,500;

14 Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House
15 Document Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$3,874,000;

17 Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document
18 Numbered 349, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

20 Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
22 cost of \$73,700;

23 Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document
24 Numbered 227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$283,700.

1 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
2 ized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them
3 on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, sub-
4 sequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which
5 form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work
6 which may have been done on these projects was approved
7 by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
8 projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reim-
9 bursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable there-
10 to for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence
11 over other pending projects of higher priority for improve-
12 ments.

13 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
14 ized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and
15 survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from
16 the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, in the
17 vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable pro-
18 visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

19 SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to
20 the city of Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their
21 successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend
22 Channel, in the county of Mobile, Alabama, by the construc-
23 tion and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said
24 channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama:

1 *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be com-
2 menced until the plans and location therefor have been filed
3 with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States
4 Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision
5 shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the
6 causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years
7 and completed within five years from the date of this Act and
8 the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby
9 expressly reserved.

10 SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor
11 Act of 1954".

12 TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

13 SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22,
14 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
15 amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938
16 (Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall
17 apply to all works authorized in this title except that for
18 any channel improvement or channel rectification project,
19 provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of
20 June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise
21 provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any
22 flood-control project herein adopted requiring local coopera-
23 tion shall expire five years from the date on which local
24 interests are notified in writing by the Department of the
25 Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said

1 interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory
2 to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation
3 will be furnished.

4 SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of
5 December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-
6 eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to
7 projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein
8 set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works
9 of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
10 tion and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein
11 set forth in full.

12 It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress
13 that the following provisions shall be observed:

14 No project or any modification not authorized, of a proj-
15 ect for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized
16 by the Congress unless a report for such project or modifica-
17 tion has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers,
18 United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

19 SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the
20 benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-
21 waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized
22 to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the
23 Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in ac-
24 cordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-
25 after designated and subject to the conditions set forth

1 therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications,
2 and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project
3 authorized in this title with funds from appropriations here-
4 tofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready
5 for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*
6 *further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated
7 as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be con-
8 sistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*,
9 That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible
10 future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall
11 be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construc-
12 tion by the Department of the Army when approved by
13 the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the
14 Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

15 CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

16 That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecti-
17 cut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936
18 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
19 amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide
20 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of
21 the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers,
22 of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene,
23 New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs here-
24 tofore authorized.

1 That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecti-
2 cut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three
3 reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend
4 sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in
5 section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December
6 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to
7 by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers,
8 and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in
9 June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the
10 eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control
11 Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

12 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

13 The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity
14 of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby
15 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
16 tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-
17 bered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$4,469,000.

19 CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

20 The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood
21 control and other purposes in central and southern Florida
22 given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as
23 amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the

1 entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended
2 by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered
3 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof
4 as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the dis-
5 cretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Pro-*
6 *vided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the author-
7 ized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control
8 Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all
9 work over and beyond that previous authorization such
10 conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they
11 shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress,
12 based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest
13 practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the
14 Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*,
15 That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established
16 by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be
17 retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan author-
18 ized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment
19 of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided*
20 *further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is
21 hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000
22 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

23 LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

24 The project for flood control and improvement of the
25 lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15,

1 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified
2 and expanded to include the following items of work and the
3 authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

4 (a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock
5 for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of
6 the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated
7 February 2, 1954, as concurred in by the report of the Chief
8 of Engineers dated April 8, 1954, with such modifications
9 as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable
10 at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation
11 lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000 in-
12 crease in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under
13 the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the
14 Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which
15 \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this
16 paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire
17 such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be
18 necessary for construction of the project except that local
19 interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the
20 Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended,
21 with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main
22 line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by
24 the United States in connection with this item: *And pro-*
25 *vided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the

1 required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engi-
2 neers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds
3 herein authorized to be appropriated.

4 (b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Missis-
5 sippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City,
6 Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the
7 Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53,
8 Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of
9 \$440,000.

10 (c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicks-
11 burg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report
12 of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85,
13 Eighty-third Congress.

14 (d) Modification of the authorized project for the New
15 Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the rec-
16 ommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document
17 Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
18 of \$1,743,000.

19 BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEXAS

20 The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide
21 flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as author-
22 ized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939,
23 and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in ac-
24 cordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

3 BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

4 The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the
5 Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek,
6 Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
7 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
8 Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there
9 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,-
10 000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

11 GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

12 The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and
13 San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substan-
14 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
15 Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third
16 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

17 GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

18 The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas,
19 authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act author-
20 izing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain
21 public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes",
22 approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such au-
23 thorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and
24 Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction,

1 operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secre-
2 tary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers
3 of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the
4 provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir
5 shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approx-
6 imately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which
7 three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for
8 flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood con-
9 trol, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for
10 sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of develop-
11 ment of electric power, at an estimated total cost of
12 \$13,300,000.

13 The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Fed-
14 eral Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate
15 to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation,
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may
17 appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-
18 flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such
19 allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable
20 costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net
21 increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage
22 capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and
23 Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation.
24 No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for

1 development of electric power shall be made under this sec-
2 tion unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such in-
3 stallation will actually be constructed.

4 The costs allocated to local interests under this section
5 shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by
6 them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act.
7 The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon
9 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the
10 appropriation available for maintenance and operation of
11 such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such
12 operation and maintenance ; the \$1,400,000 to be con-
13 tributed during the construction period shall be deposited to
14 the credit of the appropriation available for construction of
15 the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that pur-
16 pose; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief
17 of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon
18 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of
19 the United States.

20 Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon
21 Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by
22 the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance
23 with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accord-
24 ance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, opera-

1 tion, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local
2 interests and with such power to be made available to such
3 local interests.

4 Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward
5 the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir,
6 \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time
7 or times during the period of such construction, as the
8 Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the
9 contributions allocated to local interests under section 2, with
10 interest thereon at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per annum,
11 shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over
12 a period not in excess of fifty years.

13 The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement
14 with local interests providing for the payments heretofore
15 described and for all other matters relating to the operation
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which
17 require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement
18 may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water
19 conservation and stream-flow regulation for development
20 of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide
21 that the utilization of water for power development shall not
22 be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimenta-
23 tion purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized sub-

stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$2,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Henderson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 28, Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

1 The project on the Mississippi River for local flood
2 protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illi-
3 nois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
4 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
5 Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
6 mated cost of \$7,046,300.

7 The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa
8 River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance
9 with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
10 Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an
11 estimated cost of \$979,600.

12 MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

13 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
14 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for
15 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri
16 River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers,
17 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and
18 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

19 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
20 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
21 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
22 project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tribu-
23 taries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in
24 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Con-
2 gress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and
3 there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition
4 to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

5 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
6 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
7 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
8 project for flood protection on the Osage River and tribu-
9 taries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with
10 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House
11 Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

12 The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June
13 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys,
14 Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood
15 Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modi-
16 fied to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute
17 not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of
18 flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the
19 lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Pro-*
20 *vided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal
21 Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of
22 the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor
23 shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project
24 reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-
25 of-way, and public relocations which local interests would

1 have been required to bear had the approved Government
2 plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total
3 amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the
4 work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

5 The project for flood protection on the Chariton River,
6 Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in
7 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
8 neers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Con-
9 gress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

10 The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux
11 River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is
12 hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accord-
13 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers,
14 in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress,
15 at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

16 The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri
17 River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby
18 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
19 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Num-
20 bered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
21 \$212,300.

22 COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

23 The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and
24 tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in
25 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

3 OHIO RIVER BASIN

4 The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek
5 at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is
6 hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the
7 recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Docu-
8 ment Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$570,000.

10 The project for flood control and related purposes on the
11 Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substan-
12 tially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House
13 Document Numbered , Eighty-third Congress, at an
14 estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the
15 local cooperation recommended in that document, local
16 interests shall comply with the provisions of local coopera-
17 tion contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act
18 approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also con-
19 struct and maintain local drainage works required to fully
20 and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally
21 as outlined in House Document Numbered , Eighty-
22 third Congress.

23 KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

24 The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo
25 River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized sub-

stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California, approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

1 The plan of improvement for flood control on the Ameri-
2 can River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in
3 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
4 neers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

6 LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

7 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
8 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for
9 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower
10 San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of
11 December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by sub-
12 sequent Acts of Congress.

13 COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

14 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
15 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for
16 the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia
17 River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was author-
18 ized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and
19 these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power
20 development in the following projects in tributary basins, sub-
21 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
22 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531,
23 Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of
24 McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on
25 Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White

1 Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam
2 River, Oregon.

3 TERRITORY OF ALASKA

4 The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tribu-
5 taries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-
6 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in
7 House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress,
8 at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

9 TERRITORY OF HAWAII

10 The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream
11 and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii,
12 is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-
13 ommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
14 Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
15 of \$347,000.

16 SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
17 ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and sur-
18 veys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel
19 and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by
20 or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction
21 of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United
22 States and its Territorial possessions, which include the fol-
23 lowing-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or
24 formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or
25 work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no

1 supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made
2 unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the
3 Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to
4 be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such
5 review is required by the national defense or by changed
6 physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the
7 Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any
8 project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor
9 mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed
10 work shall have been adopted by law:

11 Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

12 Neponset River, Massachusetts.

13 Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Penn-
14 sylvania in the interest of flood control.

15 Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

16 Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

17 Coos Bay, Oregon.

18 SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the
19 sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated
20 for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the
21 prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be
22 carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of
23 December 22, 1944, as amended.

24 SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August
25 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Con-

gress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

“That 75 per centum of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein.”

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

“That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as

1 required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter
2 made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related pur-
3 poses by the United States, for the establishment, operation,
4 and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of
5 recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as
6 the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the
7 Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau
8 such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary
9 examinations and surveys or works of improvement author-
10 ized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and
11 related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the
12 recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to
13 allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure.”

14 SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of
15 August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood
16 Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended
17 to read as follows:

18 “That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
19 allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations here-
20 tofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood
21 control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris,
22 and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable
23 streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the
24 Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of
25 flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall

1 be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from
2 the appropriations for any one fiscal year.”

3 SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by
4 section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without
5 regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there
6 shall be established in the civil works activities under the
7 jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, seven positions to be
8 placed in grade GS-16 and two positions to be placed in
9 grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by that
10 Act.

11 ✓ SEC. 210. That section 4 of the Act approved July 24,
12 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), is
13 amended to read as follows:

14 “The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
15 Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain,
16 and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir
17 areas under the control of the Department of the Army,
18 and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation
19 of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also author-
20 ized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities
21 thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such
22 terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in
23 the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organ-
24 izations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at
25 reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the pub-

1 lic service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises:
2 *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal,
3 State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases
4 where appropriate, may be granted without monetary con-
5 siderations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion
6 of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secre-
7 tary of the Army determines such action to be in the public
8 interest, and for such periods of time and upon such con-
9 ditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That
10 in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local
11 governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for
12 the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests,
13 or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be
14 authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be neces-
15 sary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize
16 the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the develop-
17 ment, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such
18 lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid
19 to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary
20 of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas
21 of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally,
22 without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and
23 other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit
24 from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs
25 shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is

1 determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary
2 to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations
3 as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use
4 of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted
5 which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish
6 and game of the State in which such area is situated. All
7 moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges
8 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as
9 miscellaneous receipts.”

10 SEC. 211. Title II may be cited as the “Flood Control
11 Act of 1954”.

83^d CONGRESS
2^d Session

H. R. 9859

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DONDERO

JULY 12, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION, AND FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

ON

H. R. 9859

A BILL AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR,
AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON
RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION, FLOOD CON-
TROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES



JULY 15, 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan, *Chairman*

HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon
J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
MYRON V. GEORGE, Kansas
CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indiana
ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania
CHARLES G. OAKMAN, Michigan
FRANK SMALL, Jr., Maryland
HERBERT B. WARBURTON, Delaware
WILL E. NEAL, West Virginia
FRANK J. BECKER, New York
S. WALTER STAUFFER, Pennsylvania
GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York
GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., Alabama
JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
TOM STEED, Oklahoma
VERA BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania

ROBERT F. McCONNELL, *Chief Clerk and Counsel*

CHARLES G. TIERNEY, *Counsel*

RIVERS AND HARBORS SUBCOMMITTEE

HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon, *Chairman*

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
CHARLES G. OAKMAN, Michigan
HERBERT B. WARBURTON, Delaware
WILL E. NEAL, West Virginia
FRANK J. BECKER, New York

GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Illinois
TOM STEED, Oklahoma

FLOOD CONTROL SUBCOMMITTEE

RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington, *Chairman*

HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania
FRANK SMALL, Jr., Maryland
WILL E. NEAL, West Virginia
FRANK J. BECKER, New York
S. WALTER STAUFFER, Pennsylvania

CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., Alabama
JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi
JOHN C. WATTS, Kentucky

CONTENTS

Rivers and harbors:	Page
Lubec Channel, Maine-----	7
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H-----	7
Lynn Harbor, Mass-----	8
Weymouth Fore River, Mass-----	9
Town River, Quincy, Mass-----	10
Scituate Harbor, Mass-----	11
Fall River Harbor, Mass-----	12
Bullocks Point Cove, R. I-----	13
Sakonnet Harbor, R. I-----	13
Patchogue River, Conn-----	14
Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn-----	15
Westchester Creek, N. Y-----	16
Hudson River, N. Y-----	17
Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J-----	18
Hackensack River, N. J-----	19
Mispillion River, Del-----	20
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md-----	21
Queenstown Harbor, Md-----	22
Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Md-----	23
Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md-----	23
Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md-----	24
Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md-----	25
Crisfield Harbor, Md-----	26
Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md-----	27
Pocomoke River, Md-----	28
Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, Md-----	29
Parrotts Creek, Va-----	30
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va-----	31
Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va-----	32
Oyster Channel, Va-----	32
Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C-----	33
Smiths Creek, N. C-----	34
Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras and Rollinson Channel, N. C-----	35
Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway-----	36
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C-----	36
Savannah Harbor, Ga-----	37
Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla-----	38
Hillsboro River, Fla-----	39
Apalachicola Bay, Fla-----	40
Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island-----	41
St. Joseph Bay, Fla-----	42
Mobile Harbor, Ala-----	43
Dauphin Island Bay, Ala-----	44
Bayou Segnette Waterway, La-----	44
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex-----	45
Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex-----	46
Aransas Pass, Tex-----	47
Turtle Cove, Tex-----	48
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex-----	48
Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo-----	49
Mississippi River at Chester, Ill-----	50
Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn-----	50
Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn-----	51
Green and Barren Rivers, Ky-----	52

Rivers and harbors—Continued	Page
Knife River Harbor, Minn.....	53
Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.....	54
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.....	55
Holland Harbor, Mich.....	55
Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.....	56
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.....	57
Erie Harbor, Pa.....	58
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.....	59
Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.....	59
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.....	60
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.....	61
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.....	62
Port Huene, Calif.....	63
Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.....	64
Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oreg.....	65
Columbia River at the mouth, Oreg. and Wash.....	66
Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., at head of Sand Island.....	66
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.....	67
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.....	68
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven breakwater), Wash.....	69
Anacortes Harbor, Wash.....	70
Neah Bay, Wash.....	71
Bellingham Harbor, Wash.....	71
Blaine Harbor, Wash.....	72
Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.....	73
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.....	74
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.....	75
Quillayute River, Wash.....	76
Seward Harbor, Alaska.....	76
Valdez Harbor, Alaska.....	76
Honolulu Harbor, T.-H.....	77
Beach erosion:	
Hampton Beach, N. H.....	79
Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.....	79
Revere Beach, Mass.....	80
Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.....	81
South Shore, State of Rhode Island.....	83
Hammonasset River to East River (area 2), Conn.....	84
New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (area 3), Conn.....	86
Housatonic River to Ash Creek (area 7), Conn.....	88
Atlantic City, N. J.....	89
Ocean City, N. J.....	90
Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.....	91
Virginia Beach, Va.....	93
Pinellas County, Fla.....	94
Illinois shore of Lake Michigan.....	95
Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio.....	98
Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio.....	99
Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.....	100
Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.....	101
Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.....	102
Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.....	103
Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.....	105
Waikiki Beach, T. H.....	106
Flood control:	
Connecticut River Basin.....	111
Susquehanna River Basin.....	113
Central and southern Florida.....	114
Lower Mississippi River.....	116
(a) Old and Atchafalaya Rivers, control of.....	118
(b) Old and Atchafalaya Rivers, channel.....	118
(c) Vicksburg-Yazoo area.....	119
(d) New Madrid Floodway.....	120
Buffalo Bayou Basin, Tex.....	121
Brazos River Basin, Tex.....	122
Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex.....	123

Flood control—Continued	Page
Guadalupe River, Tex.....	124
Rio Grande Basin.....	125
White River Basin.....	127
Arkansas River Basin.....	128
Upper Mississippi River.....	129
(a) Alton, Ill.....	129
(b) Guttenberg, Iowa to Hamburg Bay, Ill.....	129
(c) Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8, Ill.....	130
(d) Sny Island Drainage District, Ill.....	131
(e) Upper Iowa River, Iowa.....	132
Missouri River Basin.....	133
(a) Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas.....	135
(b) Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas.....	137
(c) Kansas Citys (lower Armourdale area), Missouri and Kansas.....	139
(d) Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri.....	139
(e) Little Sioux River, Iowa.....	140
(f) Little Missouri River and tributaries, Marmarth, N. Dak.....	141
Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee.....	142
Sandy Lick Creek, Pa.....	143
Paint Rock River, Ala.....	144
Kalamazoo River, Mich.....	145
Little Calumet River, Ind.....	146
Los Angeles River Basin.....	147
Sacramento River Basin.....	148
Lower San Joaquin River Basin.....	150
Columbia River Basin.....	152
Territory of Alaska (Gold Creek and tributaries).....	155
Territory of Hawaii (Island of Hawaii).....	156

ANALYSES BY SECTIONS

Title I:	
Section 101: List of projects.....	5
Section 102: Local reimbursement, beach erosion projects.....	107
Section 103: Preliminary examinations and surveys.....	107
Section 104: Closure of Garrows Bend, Channel, Ala.....	107
Title II:	
Section 201: Laws applicable to title II.....	109
Section 202: Laws applicable to title II.....	109
Section 203: List of projects.....	109
Section 204: Preliminary examinations and surveys.....	156
Section 205: Agricultural watersheds.....	157
Section 206: Amendment re rentals from leasing reservoir lands.....	157
Section 207: Amendment re transfer of funds to the Weather Bureau..	157
Section 208: Amendment re snagging and clearing.....	158
Section 209: Grades for civil works personnel.....	158
Section 210: Amendment re land use under reservoir leases.....	160

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION
OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR
NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 15 1954.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DONDERO, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9859]

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

This omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill is the first since the act of May 17, 1950. The River and Harbor Subcommittee and the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works have held hearings on all matters contained in the bill beginning February 2, 1954. Hearings on a total of more than 85 river and harbor projects, 22 beach-erosion projects and more than 40 flood-control projects have been held, including some multiple-purpose projects, modifications of projects, increased basin authorizations, and some preliminary examinations and surveys. The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, has testified on all projects and other matters contained in this bill. Local interests have been afforded full opportunity to present their views for and against the matters under consideration. The subcommittee concerned and the full committee have met in executive session on a number of occasions and discussed the projects and other items.

A period of 4 years has elapsed since the last omnibus bill, longer than any intervening time between any preceding omnibus bills. As a result, a great number of projects were eligible for consideration.

To offset the large number of projects, the committee has attempted to hold down the total monetary authorizations by judicious use of balances of monetary authorizations available in certain river basins. With respect to existing basin authorizations, the committee has adopted the principle that in those basins where deficits in authorizations are imminent, increased amounts should be granted to permit orderly continuation of the work on the assumption that the next omnibus bill would be not later than the fiscal year 1956. In some cases the committee has approved the authorization of new basin plans of considerable scope but has limited the monetary authorization to amounts needed for the immediate future. However, the increased scope of work in these new basin plans which is not covered by monetary authorization in this bill is offset by increased monetary authorizations for work under existing basin plans where there is no increase in scope.

The active construction program for river and harbor and flood control improvements has been carried on at a steady rate since passage of the last omnibus bill. The following tabulation shows the appropriations for construction by fiscal years from 1950 to 1955:

Construction appropriations for specifically authorized projects fiscal years 1950-55

Fiscal year	Flood control ¹	Navigation	Total
1950.....	\$403,621,118	\$114,145,690	\$517,766,808
1951.....	391,222,903	114,620,500	505,843,403
1952.....	352,508,726	125,192,613	477,701,339
1953.....	288,017,348	158,440,800	446,458,148
1954.....	174,207,000	137,821,000	312,028,000
1955.....	169,685,000	157,629,600	327,314,600
Grand total.....	1,779,262,095	807,850,203	2,587,112,298

¹ Includes appropriations for construction on the Mississippi River and tributaries project, and appropriations for the Sacramento River project.

For comparative purposes, the size of the present bill is compared with the size of the omnibus bills during the last 10 years in the following table:

Act	River and harbor	Flood control	Total
1944 Flood Control Act and 1945 River and Harbor Act.....	\$381,938,000	\$950,000,000	\$1,331,938,000
1946 Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts....	521,295,000	772,000,000	1,293,295,000
1950 Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts....	203,723,125	1,250,000,000	1,453,723,125

NOTE.—Table excludes 1948 act, which covered relatively few projects of an emergency nature and was not of the magnitude of the usual omnibus bill.

The committee points out that the total of the present bill is less than \$1 billion, whereas all previous bills during the last 10 years, with the exception of the small 1948 bill which was fundamentally of an emergency nature, were appreciably in excess of \$1 billion. If increases in the general price level were taken into account, the relative reduction in the size of this bill would be much more marked.

The estimated cost of the projects reported in this bill (titles I and II) are based on current prices, which in general are those prevailing during the past year. They differ in general from the estimated

amounts in the project documents depending upon the date of the document.

The committee did not consider it advisable to fix the actual cost of the work at these figures since at the time the work is undertaken there will undoubtedly be changes in price levels and possibly modifications in the plans as a result of more detailed engineering studies. The committee, however, does not consider that any untoward increases in estimated costs are automatically authorized and expects the Corps of Engineers to appear before it in explanation of any such increases prior to construction.

The hearings referred to on the projects in this bill are available to the Congress and the public.

This report contains a description of all the projects and modifications, separated into two general categories: "Title I: Rivers and Harbors"; "Title II: Flood control." The projects contained in this report, in each title, are preceded by a general description of the matters pertaining to that title.

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The waterway transportation system of the United States is a Federal responsibility stemming from the beginning of the Nation. The work of improvement has been efficiently and competently executed by the Corps of Engineers. The size of the completed program which Congress has authorized over many years is indicated by the fact that there are now a total of 1,769 authorizations or modifications of previous authorizations for river and harbor improvements. The total cost of the completed navigation program is \$856 million. The total number of navigation projects or modifications now underway but not completed is 143 and the total cost is \$1,409 million, of which \$878 million has been appropriated through the fiscal year 1954. Navigation projects or modifications authorized but not yet started total 254 in number and have a total estimated cost of \$911 million of which \$5 million has been appropriated to date for planning purposes. The total active navigation program, therefore, amounts to 2,166 projects or modifications, having a total estimated cost of \$3,176 million, of which \$1,739 million is the cost to date. The foregoing figures exclude a few multiple-purpose projects which include other major functions in addition to navigation. Technically authorized but considered inactive or deferred for restudy are a number of navigation projects not included in the foregoing figure.

These projects lie in all parts of the United States and its possessions and include 28,000 miles of improved waterways, about 500 locks and dams, and almost 300 commercial harbors. Outstanding among them are the great coastal ports such as Boston, New York, Baltimore, Norfolk, Houston, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, the Great Lakes system and its many lake ports, and the inland and intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic and Gulf coast and through the Mississippi-Ohio artery. The substantial and widespread benefits from the navigation program have demonstrated that the investment has been wisely made, both from the standpoint of economics and national welfare. The system has facilitated the growth of trade with other nations, developed commerce among the States, and contributed to the security and continued growth of the Nation. Commercial

statistics for the latest calendar year (1952) show that the net waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890 million tons in that year, of which about 660 million were domestic and 230 million were foreign. This is 50 percent greater than the prewar peak of 1929. This committee pointed out in its report (Rept. No. 969, 81st Cong.), in connection with the 1950 River and Harbor Act, that an alltime record total of 760 million tons had been reached in 1947. The figures given above show that that alltime total was exceeded by 11 percent in only 6 years.

With respect to the inland waterways system, a total of 168 billion ton-miles were carried in the calendar year 1952. Of this total, 104 billion were on the Great Lakes and 37 billion on the Mississippi-Ohio system. This represents an increase of 42 percent in the total ton-mileage since 1940, when the total commerce was 118 billion ton-miles.

Development of these waterways during the years of peace has resulted in the acquisition of a valuable asset in time of war. For example, the inland waterways during the last war were used to float almost 4,000 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary equipment from inland shipyards to the ocean. America's rivers and canals thus served a twofold purpose during the war. They shared importantly in the transportation of strategic materials and they made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes that otherwise would have been forced into congested coastal areas.

The committee during the testimony was impressed by the increasing use of larger and more economic vessels. These vessels, with deeper draft, greater lengths and beams have accelerated the need for progressive modification of the navigation program. The use of these larger and deeper-draft carriers will result in eventual betterment of the economy and a lowering of prices to the consuming American public.

This the committee notes is one reason for the navigation survey program to be kept current in order that the improvements can be made sensitive to transportation trends. Since the survey program is the basic source of the entire navigation program, the committee feels that the backlog of preliminary examinations and surveys now assigned by the Congress to the Corps of Engineers should be more adequately financed. The future survey program should be reduced by a periodic pruning of authorized investigations so as to eliminate those which may no longer serve a useful or desired purpose.

The committee wishes to commend the Corps of Engineers for the work it has done in reviewing its outstanding investigations, with a view to classifying those obsolete as inactive.

In the following section a tabulation of the river and harbor improvements contained in this bill are listed and briefly described. In certain cases the committee has taken cognizance of the "single-user" policy under which a larger contribution is required of local interests, when the benefits are entirely or partly local in nature rather than general.

The committee has also heard testimony from the Corps of Engineers on the so-called small-boat formula and believes that this method of allocating cost to local interests, where recreational craft are in-

volved in the use of harbors, is sound. It has generally recognized the application of this formula in connection with those projects in this bill where recreational craft are of significant proportion among the users of the improvement.

Following the listing and description of the navigation projects, there is information given for the beach-erosion projects upon which testimony has been heard and which have been reported favorably by the Corps of Engineers. In general, these beach-erosion reports are the result of cooperative studies, financed jointly and equally by the United States and the local public agency requesting the study. These beach-erosion projects are improvements for the protection of the shores of the United States and its Territories. In including these projects, the committee has followed existing law which limits Federal participation to a maximum of one-third of the cost of protecting publicly owned shores. It has also recognized the general principle that because of the emergency nature of shore protection, it is not always practicable for local interests to wait for authorization and appropriation. The committee believes it equitable, therefore, and has included in the bill, provision for reimbursement to local interests, where they have found it necessary to take immediate action in protecting shorelines and where this protection has been studied and approved by the Corps of Engineers and later authorized by Congress for Federal participation.

ANALYSIS BY SECTIONS

SECTION 101

Section 101 of the bill authorizes new river and harbor projects and modifications of existing projects totaling in number 85, at an estimated additional Federal cost of \$212,915,100. Section 101 also authorizes 22 beach-erosion projects with a total estimated cost of \$14,003,664. They are shown in the following tabulation and described in the project descriptions following the tabulation.

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Lubee Channel, Maine.....	S. 243, 81st Cong.....	\$74, 000
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.....	H. 556, 82d Cong.....	952, 000
Lynn Harbor, Mass.....	H. 568, 81st Cong.....	65, 000
Weymouth Fore River, Mass.....	H. 555, 82d Cong.....	4, 400, 000
Town River, Quincy, Mass.....	H. 108, 83d Cong.....	525, 000
Scituate Harbor, Mass.....	H. 241, 83d Cong.....	375, 000
Fall River Harbor, Mass.....	H. 405, 83d Cong.....	694, 000
Bullocks Point Cove, R. I.....	H. 242, 83d Cong.....	166, 400
Sakonnet Harbor, R. I.....	H. 436, 82d Cong.....	555, 400
Patchogue River, Conn.....	H. 164, 83d Cong.....	135, 000
Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.....	H. 488, 81st Cong.....	112, 500
Westchester Creek, N. Y.....	H. 92, 82d Cong.....	32, 200
Hudson River, N. Y.....	H. 228, 83d Cong.....	31, 928, 000
Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.....	H. 89, 82d Cong.....	138, 000
Hackensack River, N. J.....	H. 252, 82d Cong.....	1, 973, 900
Mispillion River, Del.....	S. 229, 81st Cong.....	469, 400
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.....	S. 123, 83d Cong.....	101, 000, 000
Queenstown Harbor, Md.....	H. 718, 81st Cong.....	31, 900
Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Annes County, Md.....	H. 715, 81st Cong.....	23, 000
Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md.....	H. 90, 82d Cong.....	29, 000
Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md.....	H. 91, 82d Cong.....	192, 600
Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 619, 81st Cong.....	20, 300
Crisfield Harbor, Md.....	H. 435, 81st Cong.....	101, 750
Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 51, 82d Cong.....	45, 100
Pocomoke River, Md.....	H. 486, 81st Cong.....	678, 300

See footnotes at end of table, p. 6.

6 RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, Sinepuxent Bay, Md.	H. 444, 82d Cong.	\$704,000
Parrotts Creek, Va.	H. 46, 82d Cong.	38,700
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.	S. 122, 83d Cong.	6,138,700
Deen Creek, Accomack County, Va.	H. 477, 81st Cong.	95,000
Oyster Channel, Va.	S. 49, 83d Cong.	75,200
Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C.	H. 453, 81st Cong.	108,000
Smiths Creek, N. C.	H. 170, 83d Cong.	102,000
Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, N. C.	H. 411, 83d Cong.	175,000
Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 379, 81st Cong.	43,200
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.	H. 469, 81st Cong.	765,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	H. 110, 83d Cong.	414,900
Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla.	H. 446, 82d Cong.	82,200
Hillsboro River, Fla.	H. 567, 81st Cong.	16,600
Apalachicola Bay, Fla.	H. 156, 82d Cong.	98,000
Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island.	H. 557, 82d Cong.	635,700
St. Joseph Bay, Fla.	H. 595, 81st Cong.	1,312,000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	H. 74, 83d Cong.	5,778,000
Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.	H. 394, 82d Cong.	70,000
Bayou Segnette Waterway, La.	H. 413, 83d Cong.	520,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.	S. 80, 83d Cong.	6,875,000
Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex.	H. 478, 81st Cong.	74,300
Aranas Pass, Tex., in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.	H. 376, 83d Cong.	30,700
Turtle Cove, Tex.	H. 654, 81st Cong.	40,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.	H. 89, 83d Cong.	829,100
Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.	H. 251, 82d Cong.	82,600
Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.	H. 230, 83d Cong.	65,000
Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn.	H. 347, 83d Cong.	142,000
Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.	S. 81, 83d Cong.	
Green and Barren, Ky.	S. 82, 83d Cong.	3,434,000
Knife River Harbor, Minn.	H. 463, 83d Cong.	219,900
Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.	H. 434, 83d Cong.	220,000
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.	H. 554, 82d Cong.	217,200
Holland Harbor, Mich.	H. 282, 83d Cong.	574,400
Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.	H. 142, 82d Cong.	225,000
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.	H. 620, 81st Cong.	512,000
Erie Harbor, Pa.	H. 345, 83d Cong.	174,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	H. 423, 83d Cong.	270,000
Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.	H. 246, 83d Cong.	36,900
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	H. 487, 81st Cong.	2,459,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor, Calif.	H. 161, 83d Cong.	896,500
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.	H. 389, 83d Cong.	3,869,000
Port Hueneme, Calif.	H. 362, 83d Cong.	5,437,000
Rogue River, harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.	S. 83, 83d Cong.	3,758,700
Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oreg.	S. 133, 81st Cong.	41,000
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.	H. 249, 83d Cong.	8,555,000
Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island.	S. 8, 83d Cong.	227,100
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.	H. 425, 83d Cong.	977,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.	H. 412, 83d Cong.	421,800
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven breakwater), Wash.	H. —, 83d Cong.	323,700
Anacortes Harbor, Wash.	S. 102, 83d Cong.	179,300
Neah Bay, Wash.	H. 404, 83d Cong.	139,250
Bellingham Harbor, Wash.	H. 558, 82d Cong.	1,366,650
Blaine Harbor, Wash.	H. 240, 83d Cong.	436,000
Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.	H. 536, 81st Cong.	3,397,300
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.	H. 155, 82d Cong.	477,900
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.	H. 569, 81st Cong.	395,500
Quillayute River, Wash.	H. 579, 81st Cong.	425,550
Seward Harbor, Alaska.	H. 182, 83d Cong.	81,200
Valdez Harbor, Alaska.	do.	116,600
Honolulu Harbor, T. H.	H. 717, 81st Cong.	3,022,000
Total.		212,915,100

¹ H indicates House document; S indicates Senate document.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

LUBEC CHANNEL, MAINE

(S. Doc. 243, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: 200 miles northeast of Portland, Maine, between Maine and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada.

Report authorized by: Senate Committee on Commerce resolution, July 16, 1945.

Existing project: Channel from Johnson Bay to Quoddy Roads 12 by 500 feet with breakwater at northerly end of narrows. Completed 1905. Costs to June 30, 1951, \$303,400 for new work and \$7,000 for maintenance.

Plan of recommended improvement: Extension of existing breakwater for 90 feet and construction of a new breakwater 385 feet long at Short Point.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$50,700	\$500	\$51,200
Current.....	74,000	1,000	75,000

Local cooperation: Provide suitable public landing (cost estimated to be self-liquidating), easements, and hold and save United States free from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$2,660	\$3,135
Maintenance.....	400	600
Total.....	3,060	3,735
Annual benefits: Prevention boat damage.....	7,500	10,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.4	2.7

Remarks: Improvement justified for removing hazards to navigation and so preventing damage to boats.

PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, MAINE AND N. H.

(H. Doc. 556, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H., is formed by the confluence of Salmon Falls and Cocheco Rivers, and flows 13 miles generally southeast to the Atlantic Ocean. The lower portion of the river, known as Portsmouth Harbor, is 55 miles northeast of Boston.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Public Works resolution adopted February 17, 1949.

Existing project: Provides for a stone breakwater extending from Goat Island to Newcastle Island, removal of a portion of Gangway Rock, removal of a portion of ledge at Badgers Island, and the removal of Pier Rock, all to specified depths.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for the removal of ledge rock in the vicinity of Gangway Rock, the southwest point of Badgers Island, and Boiling Rock to 35 feet below mean low water.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$834, 000	-----	\$834, 000
Current.....	952, 000	-----	952, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$33, 600	\$34, 800
Maintenance.....	600	700
Total.....	34, 200	35, 500
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of damage.....	20, 000	22, 500
Operational savings.....	28, 600	29, 700
Total.....	48, 600	52, 200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 4	1. 47

Remarks: Particularly hazardous navigational difficulties prevail at the three submerged ledges at which improvements are recommended. Their removal would permit safer navigation and maneuvering, particularly for deep-draft vessels of 10,000 tons or more.

LYNN HARBOR, MASS.

(H. Doc. 568, 81st Cong.)

Location: Lynn Harbor, a natural harbor at the head of Broad Sound, is about 14 miles by water northeasterly from Boston.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Committee resolution March 19, 1946, and River and Harbor Act, 1946.

Existing project: Channel 22 feet deep by 300 feet wide from Bass Point, Nahant, to a turning basin 550 feet wide at the head of the harbor. Completed 1934. Federal costs to June 30, 1951, \$755,000 new work and \$102,500 maintenance. Depth of 25 feet authorized but not undertaken due to lack of local cooperation.

Plan of recommended improvement: Enlargement of turning basin by including in Federal project easterly 300 feet of municipal channel and dredging this area to a depth of 25 feet. Initial dredging to 22 feet. Additional dredging to 25 feet to be done when local interests comply with conditions of local cooperation required under existing project.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$48,500	¹ \$3,500	\$52,000
Current.....	65,000	¹ 4,700	69,700

¹ Cash contribution.

Local cooperation: Provide lands, etc.; hold and save United States from damages; contribute in cash the cost of dredging the easterly 300 feet of the channel to depth of 22 feet, presently estimated to cost \$4,700.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$2,315	\$2,510
Maintenance.....	560	740
Total.....	2,875	3,250

Annual benefits: Project modification is not based on monetary evaluation of benefits but on alleviating difficulty of navigating larger ships now in use in negotiating the turn from the Federal basin into the municipal channel.

Benefit-cost ratio: On above basis, benefit-cost ratio is considered to be at least 1 to 1.

Remarks: The improvement would provide a suitable channel for modern coal-carrying vessels and is considered justified in the interest of increased safety and convenience to general navigation.

WEYMOUTH FORE RIVER, MASS.

(H. Doc. 555, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in Braintree, Mass., and flows northward 7.5 miles into Hingham Bay on the south side of Boston Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 22, 1947.

Existing project: Provides for 27-foot channel from Nantasket Roads into Weymouth Fore River above Weymouth Fore Bridge, varying in width from 300 feet to 500 feet with turning basin at the head of navigation.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel 32 feet deep in rock, 30 feet in other material, from deep water in Boston Harbor to Weymouth Fore Bridge in Weymouth Fore River, varying in width from 300 feet to 500 feet, and a maneuvering basin above the bridge 30 feet deep.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3, 412, 055	\$50, 680	\$3, 462, 735
Current.....	4, 400, 000	64, 400	4, 464, 400

Local cooperation: Hold and save United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance of the improvement, and make utility relocations.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$134, 990	\$158, 280
Maintenance.....	500	700
Total.....	135, 490	158, 980
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....	369, 116	477, 500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.72	3.0

Remarks: Project serves a highly industrialized area with a population of more than 126,000. Project justified on prospective commerce of more than 3 million tons. Commerce in 1952 amounted to more than 2 million tons.

TOWN RIVER, QUINCY, MASS.

(H. Doc. 108, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Entirely within the city limits of Quincy, Mass., tributary to Weymouth Fore River, a part of Boston Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, December 2, 1946.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 24 feet deep, 150 feet wide from Weymouth Fore River into Town River for a distance of 1.3 miles, a turning basin 18 feet deep and a channel 15 feet deep extending 0.25 miles further.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for deepening the existing 24-foot channel to a depth of 27 feet with a width of 250 feet and the basin to a depth of 24 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$450, 000	\$150, 000	\$600, 000
Current.....	525, 000	175, 000	700, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish spoil disposal areas, bulkhead, low-spoil areas, hold and save United States free of damages; contribute in cash 25 percent of the cost of construction presently estimated at \$175,000.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$23,900	\$24,700
Maintenance.....	4,000	4,600
Total.....	27,900	29,300
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....	127,900	146,700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.6	5.0

Remarks: Quincy is in the Boston industrial area with a population of over 83,000. Waterborne commerce in 1951 was over 600,000 tons. Project is amply justified by savings in transportation costs.

SCITUATE HARBOR, MASS.

(H. Doc. 241, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Indentation in the coastline of Massachusetts Bay about 13 miles southeast of Boston Harbor.

Report authorized by: House River and Harbor Committee Resolution, July 20, 1946.

Existing project: Entrance channel 12 feet by 200 feet from Massachusetts Bay to a point 70 feet west of the existing south jetty; thence a harbor channel 10 feet by 150 feet extending westward 1,500 feet; an anchorage 10 feet by 1,500 feet by 460 feet along the north side of harbor channel; extension of north jetty 300 feet easterly; and maintenance of extended north and south jetties. Existing project completed in 1940. Costs to June 30, 1952, \$176,796 for new work and \$7,431 for maintenance.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide for: (1) a main harbor channel 10 feet by 200 feet, extending from the existing 12-foot entrance channel to about 50 feet south of the town wharf; (2) an inner harbor channel 10 feet by 150 feet, extending about 470 feet southerly from the main harbor channel; (3) an anchorage basin 8 feet by 400 feet by 1,500 feet in extension of northwesterly side of the existing Federal 10-foot anchorage; and (4) an inner anchorage basin 10 feet by 100 feet by 900 feet at the head of the inner harbor channel.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$334,000	\$223,000	\$557,000
Current.....	375,000	250,000	625,000

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash 40 percent of the construction cost, estimated at \$223,000 in the project document and currently estimated at \$250,000, and furnish all lands and suitable spoil-disposal areas; provide adequate berthing facilities at the lumber wharf; hold and save the United States free from damages; and also subject to the condition that no dredging shall be done by the Federal Government within 50 feet of any wharf or structure unless a waiver of damage is signed.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$22, 600	\$22, 130
Maintenance.....	3, 700	4, 150
Total (approximate).....	26, 300	26, 300
Annual benefits:		
Land enhancement.....	300	300
Fish.....	18, 200	20, 500
Transportation.....	2, 500	2, 800
Recreational.....	53, 600	60, 200
Total.....	74, 600	83, 800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2. 8	3. 2

Remarks: Major benefits will accrue to the owners of recreational craft from the enlarged facilities. A cash contribution of 40 percent of the actual construction cost is required.

FALL RIVER HARBOR, MASS. AND R. I.

(H. Doc. 405, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Essentially within Mount Hope Bay, about 50 miles south of Boston, Mass.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Public Works resolution adopted July 6, 1949.

Existing project: Channel from deep water in bay, 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide, thence along waterfronts of Fall River and Tiverton with turning basin 35 feet deep at head of navigation.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for deepening the mid-bay channel to 35 feet for a width of 400 feet between deep water in Mount Hope Bay and Globe Wharf at Fall River; this improvement to be in lieu of the authorized waterfront channel.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Current (report).....	\$694, 000	-----	\$694, 000

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States free of damages.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	Current
Interest and amortization.....	\$26, 700
Maintenance.....	4, 000
Total.....	30, 700
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....	34, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 11

Remarks: The principal remaining need in Fall River Harbor is for a 35-foot-deep entrance channel to the Massachusetts section of the harbor. Waterborne commerce in 1951 amounted to more than 1,750,000 tons.

BULLOCKS POINT COVE, R. I.

(H. Doc. 242, 83d Cong.)

Location: East shore, Providence River, 4.5 miles south of Providence Harbor, R. I. Lower half-mile of the cove, covering approximately 100 acres, is separated from Providence River by a small peninsula.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Entrance channel 8 feet x 75 feet from deep water in Providence River to the cove entrance, thence 6 feet x 75 feet to and including a turning basin 6 feet deep (2.9 acres) opposite Haines Park; a south mooring basin 6 feet deep (8.3 acres) opposite the boat club; and for reconstruction of Bullock Point with dredged sand fill and jetty to a height of 9 feet above mean low tide for about 450 feet easterly of the 1948 mean high-water line.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$145,000	\$136,400	\$281,400
Current.....	166,400	158,000	324,400

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash 42 percent of the construction cost estimated at \$103,400 (December 1950) and currently at \$120,000 (September 1953); plus lands, bulkheads, public landing; hold and save the United States free from damage; and establish a public body to regulate the waterway.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$11,535	\$11,520
Maintenance.....	3,150	3,650
Total.....	14,685	15,170
Annual benefits:		
Recreational boats.....	22,100	25,500
Fishing fleet.....	2,000	2,300
Land enhancement.....	520	400
Total.....	24,620	28,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.7	1.9

Remarks: Widespread recreational benefits; therefore, a local cash contribution of 42 percent of the actual construction cost is required.

SAKONNET HARBOR, R. I.

(H. Doc. 436, 82d Cong.)

Location: Cove, 900 by 1,200 feet, on the east side of entrance to Sakonnet River, 7 miles east of Newport Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 13, 1948.

Existing project: The authorized project, completed in 1908, provides for a breakwater 400 feet long and for the removal of rock nearest the breakwater to a depth of 8 feet. Costs to June 30, 1950: \$72,498—\$62,202 for new work and \$10,296 for maintenance. Local interests have constructed four privately owned wharves.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for extending the breakwater northeasterly 400 feet, top width 15 feet at 8 feet above mean low water, and dredging the harbor to a depth of 8 feet below mean low water, including removal of rock pile in the center of the harbor.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$465,800	\$18,700	\$484,500
Current.....	555,400	23,000	578,400

Local cooperation: Project document recommends local interests contribute \$18,700 in cash toward the cost of construction; furnish lands and rights-of-way, and hold and save the United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$19,335	\$20,870
Maintenance.....	¹ 1,300	¹ 1,560
Total.....	20,635	22,430
Annual benefits:		
Elimination vessel damage.....	3,000	3,600
Fishing.....	37,400	44,800
Recreational boating.....	3,420	4,100
Total.....	43,820	52,500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.1	2.3

¹ Includes \$1,000 additional Corps of Engineers cost.

² Includes \$1,200 additional Corps of Engineers cost.

Remarks: Sakonnet Harbor is useful as a harbor of refuge; close to several fishing banks and waters used extensively for pleasure boating. Because of recreational benefits a local cash contribution of 4 percent of the project cost, presently estimated as \$23,000, is required.

PATCHOGUE RIVER, CONN.

(H. Doc. 164, 83d Cong.)

Location: Patchogue River is situated in the town of Westbrook, Conn., on the north shore of Long Island Sound about 7 miles west of the Connecticut River.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel 8 feet deep, 75 feet wide, from Duck Island Roads to highway bridge on U. S. Route 1, a distance of 5,100 feet, together with an anchorage basin and jetty.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$120,000	¹ \$80,000	\$200,000
Current.....	135,000	¹ 91,000	226,000

¹ Cash contribution.

Local cooperation: Usual lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States from damages, and contribute in cash 40 percent of the total cost of construction estimated at the time Federal funds are made available for the project.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$8,250	\$8,190
Maintenance.....	5,250	5,980
Total.....	13,500	14,170
Annual benefits:		
General.....	25,325	28,705
Local.....	7,560	8,525
Total.....	32,885	37,230
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.4	2.6

Remarks: Improvement is considered warranted to provide for navigation at all stages of the tide; to provide adequate anchorage area for fishing and recreational craft; and to provide refuge for small boats. A local cash contribution of 40 percent of the total cost of construction is required in view of the large local benefits.

WESTPORT HARBOR AND SAUGATUCK RIVER, CONN.

(H. Doc. 488, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Saugatuck River empties into Long Island Sound 11 miles southwest of the entrance to Bridgeport Harbor. The navigable portion of the river is known as Westport Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, February 1, 1946.

Existing project: Provides for channel 4 by 60 feet to Westport; repair of the Cedar Point breakwater, and removal of ledge rock and boulders from the channel. Project 70 percent complete. Costs to June 30, 1951, for new work were \$32,100, and for maintenance \$16,600, a total of \$48,700. A yacht basin about 12 feet deep at Cedar Point with entrance channel about 1,600 feet long has been constructed by local interests at a cost of \$175,000.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide for a channel 9 by 125 feet across the outer bar, thence 100 feet wide to highway bridge at Saugatuck, with a turning and anchorage basin 6 feet deep (3.5 acres).

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$81,550	\$27,000	\$108,550
Current.....	112,500	37,500	150,000

Local cooperation: Project document recommends cash contribution from local interests equal to 25 percent of the initial cost but not to exceed \$27,000; plus all lands, easements, rights-of-way and spoil areas; bulkheads; hold and save the United States free from damages; and provide and maintain a public landing. Chief of Engineers currently recommends waiving limitation on cash contribution.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$4,800	\$5,200
Maintenance (Federal).....	2,300	3,100
Total.....	7,100	8,400
Annual benefits.....	14,750	16,460
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.1	2.0

Remarks: The project modification is essential to relieve congestion and permit safe navigation. Benefits would accrue to recreational craft that use the harbor. In view of local benefits, a cash contribution equal to 25 percent of the initial cost is required, and should be based on the actual cost of construction without a specific upper limit.

WESTCHESTER CREEK, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 92, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In the Bronx, New York City, 14 miles northeast of the Battery.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Channel 12 by 100 feet wide for 2,000 feet through estuary; thence 8 feet wide for 3,000 feet; thence 60 feet wide for 8,800 feet with 2 turning basins.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide a larger turning basin 12 by 250 by 250 feet about 500 feet downstream from head of navigation.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$27,000	\$90,000	\$117,000
Current.....	32,200	132,700	164,900

Local cooperation: Lands, rights-of-way, and disposal areas; hold and save United States free from damage; provide bulkheads; and provide a public wharf when needed.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$4,890	\$5,830
Maintenance.....	1,400	1,700
Total.....	6,290	7,530
Annual benefits:		
Transportation savings.....	9,700	23,170
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	3.1

Remarks: The proposed turning basin would permit use of larger tankers. The prospective savings are well in excess of the additional cost.

HUDSON RIVER, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 228, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Hudson River rises in northeastern New York, flows south 299 miles to New York City and 16 miles within city limits to New York Bay. Section under consideration extends from New York City limits northward to Troy, N. Y.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, March 21, 1945, and River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, with respect to North Germantown, N. Y.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 27 feet deep at mean low water from New York City to mile 144 at Albany, 300 feet wide with an additional 100 feet of width through rock cuts above Hudson; thence 14 feet deep at lowest low water and generally 400 feet wide from Albany to the Federal lock at Troy; and thence 14 feet deep and 200 feet wide to the State barge canal at Waterford.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for a channel 600 feet wide from New York City to Kingston, and thence 400 feet wide to Albany with widening at bends, a turning basin 700 feet wide and 1,200 feet long at Albany, and 2 anchorages, 1 near Hudson and 1 near Stuyvesant, 400 feet wide by 2,400 feet long, all with depths of 32 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$30,700,000	\$1,120,000	\$31,820,000
Current.....	31,928,000	1,166,000	33,094,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil disposal areas for new work and maintenance; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide suitable depths in the approaches and berths at terminals; construct and maintain a suitable bulkhead on the east side of the proposed turning basin or permit dredging of a slope; provide and maintain at the port of Albany sufficient storage and handling facilities; continue to regulate the use of the harbor facilities at Albany.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,388,000	\$1,281,500
Maintenance (additional).....	170,000	183,400
Total.....	1,558,000	1,464,900
Annual benefits.....	2,411,190	2,767,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.89

Remarks: A more commodious channel between New York City and Albany, a turning basin at Albany and anchorages are needed for deep-draft shipping. Freight in 1952 totaled over 6,300,000 tons at the port of Albany and over 18 million tons on the waterway from Waterford, N. Y., to the New York City limits.

SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, N. J.

(H. Doc. 89, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Shoal Harbor is on Sandy Hook Bay, 19 miles south of the Battery, New York City. Compton Creek empties into Shoal Harbor at Port Monmouth, N. J., and is navigable for about 1 mile to the fixed bridge at Church Street.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 8 feet deep from deep water in Sandy Hook Bay to a point 1,000 feet above the Main Street Bridge with widths of 150 feet in the bay and 75 feet in the creek. Project completed to the bridge in 1936; no work done above bridge. As of June 30, 1951, the total cost of new work was \$30,282, and maintenance \$152,810.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide for deepening the existing channel to 12 feet to the first bend in the creek, including extension in Sandy Hook Bay.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$105,000	\$112,500	\$217,000
Current.....	138,000	147,800	285,800

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash 50 percent of the first cost presently estimated at \$138,000, and in addition furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; and deepen to 14 feet the berths at the terminals; and provided further that no work shall be undertaken until local interests have complied with the outstanding conditions of local cooperation required under the existing project which pertains to the construction of a public wharf.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$8,890	\$10,100
Maintenance.....	¹ 12,550	² 16,700
Total.....	21,440	26,800
Annual benefits:		
Reduction vessel damage.....	10,000	13,000
Reduction vessel delays.....	5,000	6,500
Additional fish catch.....	17,000	22,200
Total.....	32,000	41,700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.6

¹ Includes \$12,050 Corps of Engineers maintenance.² Includes \$15,800 Corps of Engineers maintenance.

Remarks: The general benefits are considered sufficient to warrant Federal participation in the project if local interests agree to contribute 50 percent of the first cost in addition to other requirements of local cooperation. The local contribution should not be limited to a specific sum as stated in the report. The recommended improvement is economically justified and would provide sufficient depths in the entrance to eliminate damages and delays to the larger fish boats.

HACKENSACK RIVER, N. J.

(H. Doc. 252, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Rises near Haverstraw, N. Y., and flows 45 miles through Hackensack (mile 16.5) to Newark Bay at Jersey City.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides a 35-foot channel in lower Newark Bay to junction of Hackensack and Passaic Rivers; a 30 by 400-foot channel in Hackensack River to mile 1.1; a 30 by 300-foot channel to mile 3.9; 12 by 200 feet to mile 14.0; and 12 by 150 feet to mile 16.5. Project completed in 1930.

Plan of recommended improvement: Deepen existing 30-foot channel to 32 feet (34 feet in rock) including approach channel in Newark Bay.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,463,000	\$49,000	\$1,512,000
Current.....	1,973,900	64,700	2,038,600

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and spoil disposal areas; provide project depths in approaches and berths of terminal facilities; hold and save United States from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$58,970	\$72,000
Maintenance.....	10,100	13,060
Total.....	69,070	85,060
Annual benefits:		
Transportation savings.....	100,600	126,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.5

Remarks: Project serves an area with tributary population of about 2 million. Waterborne commerce 4 million tons annually. Justified by reduction in lost time and accidents to vessels.

MISPILLION RIVER, DEL.

(S. Doc. 229, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in central Delaware, flows northeasterly 20 miles and enters Delaware Bay about 16 miles northwest of Cape Henlopen. The river is tidal to a dam at Milford at mile 12.

Report authorized by Senate Public Works Committee resolution, April 27, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 6 feet deep from Delaware Bay to Milford, including 4 cutoffs and 2 parallel stone-filled pile and timber jetties 210 feet apart at the entrance. Channel widths are 80 feet from the bay to the mouth of the river, thence 60 feet in the river and 50 feet in the cutoffs with additional widths at sharp bends. The south jetty is 5,850 feet long and the north jetty 6,496 feet. The project was completed in 1939.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel 9 feet deep and 80 feet wide from like depth in Delaware Bay to the landward end of the jetties, thence 60 feet wide to the head of navigation at Milford, a turning basin 120 feet wide and 350 feet long located about 500 feet downstream from the Washington Street Bridge in Milford, and 3 cutoffs to eliminate the bends between Cains and Maloneys landings, in the vicinity of Lock Hall landing, and near Beswicks landing.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$414,000	\$200	\$414,200
Current.....	469,400	200	469,600

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil disposal areas; and hold and save the United States free from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$16,100	\$16,650
Maintenance.....	16,075	18,000
Total.....	32,175	34,650
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....	55,000	63,300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.7	1.8

Remarks: Existing project depth in Mispillion River between Delaware Bay and the town of Milford is inadequate for existing and prospective commerce. The recommended improvement would permit use of more efficient vessels and more effective use of craft now operating on the river, as well as water movement of quantities of commerce now transported by more expensive means. The modification is economically justified.

INLAND WATERWAY FROM DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY,
DEL. AND MD.

(S. Doc. 123, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: This waterway, known as the Cheapeake and Delaware Canal, connects Delaware Bay and Chesapeake Bay by means of a land-cut canal at sea level.

Report authorized by Senate Commerce Committee resolution, March 28, 1939.

Existing project: The Chesapeake and Delaware ship canal, 46 miles long, connects with Delaware River at Reedy Point, Del., with entrance jetties, extends westerly by land-cut 14 miles to Back Creek, at Chesapeake City, Md.; then 5 miles in Back Creek to Elk River; then through Elk River and Chesapeake Bay, 27 miles to vicinity of Pooles Island. The United States maintains and operates high-level fixed bridges at St. Georges and Chesapeake City and vertical lift bridges at Summit and Reedy Point. The Pennsylvania Railroad owns and operates its lift bridge, two-thirds of the first cost of which was borne by the United States.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to provide a depth of 35 feet over a bottom width of 450 feet in the main channel including a cut-off at the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge; high-level railroad bridge, to be owned and operated by Pennsylvania Railroad; high-level fixed highway bridges, with 4 lanes at Summit and 2 lanes at Reedy Point; anchorage in Elk River 35 feet by 1,200 feet by 3,700 feet; and revetment of banks as necessary.

Estimated cost (all Federal):

Report.....	\$96,000,000
Current.....	101,000,000

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges.....	\$4, 250, 000	\$4, 080, 000
Annual benefits.....	5, 160, 000	5, 415, 000
Benefit-cost rate.....	1. 21	1. 33

Remarks: In construction of all highway bridges and approaches, the standards of local cooperation required by the project shall be the same as those applied to the construction of the St. Georges Bridge.

QUEENSTOWN HARBOR, MD.

(H. Doc. 718, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Queenstown Creek is an estuary about 2 miles long on the easterly side of Chesapeake Bay about 35 miles southeast of Baltimore.

Report authorized by House Committee on Public Works; resolution adopted June 17, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 10 by 200 feet from Chester River to Queenstown Creek, a distance of about 4,000 feet.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide for a channel 7 by 75 feet from Queenstown Creek to the vicinity of the town wharf in Little Queenstown Creek and for a mooring basin 7 by 300 by 300 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$26, 300	-----	\$26, 300
Current.....	31, 900	-----	31, 900

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages, including such damage as may occur to oyster beds.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1, 120	\$1, 195
Maintenance.....	1, 000	1, 000
Total.....	2, 120	2, 195
Annual benefits:		
Savings boat operation.....	455	500
Increased oyster production.....	4, 600	5, 520
Savings boat repair.....	750	860
Total.....	5, 805	6, 880
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2. 7	3. 1

Remarks: A number of small boats operating from Little Queenstown Creek are damaged and incur lost working time because of inadequate depths in Little Queenstown Creek and at its mouth. The proposed modification of the existing project would remedy these conditions and is economically justified.

LITTLE CREEK, KENT ISLAND, QUEEN ANNES COUNTY, MD.

(H. Doc. 715, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: A tidal estuary 2,600 feet long tributary to Crab Alley Bay, an arm of Eastern Bay, which in turn joins Chesapeake Bay south of Kent Island.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide a channel 7 by 60 feet, about 1,850 feet long from Crab Alley Bay to and including a basin 150 by 250 feet opposite the existing boat yard in Little Creek.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$22,000	\$1,000	\$23,000
Current.....	23,000	1,100	24,100

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages, including such damage as may occur to oysterbeds; and provide and maintain an adequate public wharf with suitable approach channel.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$985	\$945
Maintenance.....	915	915
Total.....	1,900	1,860
Annual benefits:		
Prevention boat damage.....	800	900
Increased oyster catch.....	11,000	13,000
Total.....	11,800	13,900
Benefit-cost ratio.....	6.2	7.5

Remarks: Inadequate natural depths in Little Creek cause damages and appreciable loss of time to the considerable number of oyster boats now using Little Creek. The proposed project would eliminate some boat damage, and, by improving operational conditions, would increase working time and seafood production. The benefits are well in excess of the costs and the project is economically justified.

ANCHORAGE AT LOWES WHARF, TALBOT COUNTY, MD.

(H. Doc. 90, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In Ferry Cove on the eastern shore of Chesapeake Bay, about 6 miles north of Choptank River and southeast of Annapolis.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: A channel 7 by 60 feet from the 7-foot depth in the cove to and including a basin 200 by 300 feet on the south side of Lowes Wharf.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$27,000	\$6,000	\$33,000
Current.....	29,000	6,400	35,400

Local cooperation: Furnish all rights-of-way and suitable spoil disposal areas; remove existing piling, etc., within the limits of the work; construct public landing; and hold and save the United States free from damages, including such damages as may occur to oysterbeds.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,410	\$1,325
Maintenance.....	1,990	1,990
Total.....	2,400	2,315
Annual benefits:		
Increased oyster production.....	3,000	3,600
Prevention oyster boat damage.....	375	430
Reduction fuel costs.....	132	145
Total.....	3,507	4,175
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.8

¹ Includes \$500 Corps of Engineers maintenance.

Remarks: The present harbor lacks adequate depths and protection for fishing vessels. Storm and ice damages also cause lost fishing time. The larger bay-boats when in the vicinity must travel to other harbors for overnight stops. The proposed improvement would alleviate these conditions, is satisfactory to local interests, and is economically justified.

NANTICOKE RIVER, BIVALVE, WICOMICO COUNTY, MD.

(H. Doc. 91, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Bivalve is 6 miles above the mouth of Nanticoke River, about 113 miles southeast of Baltimore.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provision of a protected anchorage basin 7 by 150 by 350 feet initially with an ultimate length of 550 feet and an approach channel 60 by 1,400 feet protected by twin rock jetties 1,000 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Initial development.....	\$167,300	\$10,000	\$177,300
Ultimate development.....	180,000	10,000	190,000
Current:			
Initial development.....	179,000	10,700	189,700
Ultimate development.....	192,600	10,700	203,300

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, etc., spoil-disposal areas; hold and save United States free from damage including damage to oyster beds; public landing; and relocate powerline.

Project economics (initial development):

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$7,100	\$6,880
Maintenance.....	2,590	2,500
Total.....	9,600	9,380
Annual benefits:		
Increased oyster catch.....	12,000	14,400
Boat-damage reduction.....	600	690
Total.....	12,600	15,090
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.3	1.6

Remarks: The ultimate basin is authorized but no construction beyond the initial stage is to be undertaken until the additional length is found justified.

WEBSTER COVE, SOMERSET COUNTY, MD.

(H. Doc. 619, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Webster Cove is the site of an improved small-boat harbor located in the marsh on the southeasterly side of the Wicomico River about 3 miles above the mouth. Wicomico River enters Chesapeake Bay from the east 85 miles southeast of Baltimore.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: The existing Federal navigation project for Wicomico River includes provision of a basin 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and 400 feet long in Webster Cove with an entrance channel 6 feet deep and 60 feet wide from deep water in the Wicomico River. This work was completed in 1940.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for enlargement of the existing basin at Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md., by dredging an extension 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and 200 feet long on each side of the existing basin to form a T-shaped harbor.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$19,000	\$1,200	\$20,200
Current.....	20,300	1,300	21,600

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas; acquire and reserve for public use a strip of land to guarantee free public access to basin; and hold and save the United States free from all damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$908	
Maintenance.....	900	
Total.....	1,708	\$1,660
Annual benefits:		
Savings in boat damages.....	1,250	1,440
Increased production.....	1,000	1,200
Total.....	2,250	2,640
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.31	1.59

Remarks: The existing harbor at Webster Cove is too small to accommodate all the boats in the area and is exposed to wind and wave action. The proposed improvement would provide a protected harbor of adequate size and is economically justified.

CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD.

(H. Doc. 435, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On the left bank of Little Annemessex River, on the east side of Chesapeake Bay, 115 miles southeast of Baltimore, Md.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 12 by 425 feet from Tangier Sound to Somers Cove Light, thence 266 feet wide to the bend about 1,800 feet southwest of the railroad pier at Crisfield, and thence of irregular width to a point opposite the Consumers Ice Co.; a spur channel 10 by 100 feet from the ice plant to Hop Point; a channel 7 by 60 feet from the 7 foot depth in Little Annemessex River via Cedar Creek, a land cut, and Daugherty Creek to Big Annemessex River; and a mooring basin 7 by 160 by 875 feet generally parallel to Brick Kiln Road, with a channel 7 by 100 feet leading therefrom to the 7 feet project channel connecting Little Annemessex and Big Annemessex Rivers.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of an anchorage basin in Somers Cove 10 by 600 by 1,000 feet with an approach channel 10 by 100 feet from the 10 foot depth in Little Annemessex River through a land cut in Jersey Island to the south side of the basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$78,750	\$53,000	\$131,750
Current.....	101,750	74,000	175,750

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages, remove existing structures from the area to be dredged; construct a suitable road connecting the lower portion of Jersey Island with Crisfield; and make a cash contribution toward the cost of the improvement equivalent to the difference in Federal costs between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken. The cash contribution based on current prices would be \$43,200.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$5,320	\$6,240
Maintenance (Corp of Engineers).....	2,000	2,000
Total.....	7,320	8,240
Annual benefits: Prevention of boat damage.....	20,000	23,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.7	2.8

Remarks: The present harbor is congested and some boats of necessity not only must tie up five abreast but must also stay at exposed locations, resulting in severe boat damage. The improvement is economically justified by the elimination of vessel damages that will result under improved conditions.

RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, SOMERSET COUNTY, MD.

(H. Doc. 51, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Rhodes Point and Tylerton are two settlements about 1.5 miles apart on Smith Island, which is located between Chesapeake Bay and Tangier Sound about 60 miles north of the Virginia Capes.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: There is no existing project for improvements between Rhodes Point and Tylerton.

Plan of recommended improvement: Adoption of a project to provide for a channel 4 feet deep and 59 feet wide from Tylerton to Rhodes Point via Rhodes Point Gut.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$42,000	-----	\$42,000
Current.....	45,100	-----	45,100

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil disposal areas, and hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,760	
Maintenance.....	500	
Total.....	2,260	\$2,310
Annual benefits:		
Increased production.....	3,240	3,600
Transportation savings.....	660	750
Total.....	3,840	4,300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.60	1.86

Remarks: The residents of Smith Island are dependent on water transportation for their livelihood. At present, access to Rhodes Point and Tylerton, and between these communities, is restricted to periods of high tide. Local seafood industry has been handicapped by lack of an adequate channel. The proposed improvement is economically justified.

POCOMOKE RIVER, MD.

(H. Doc. 486, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in southern part of Delaware, flows southwest 54 miles to enter Pocomoke Sound on the east side of Chesapeake Bay, 40 miles north of Cape Charles, Va.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 7 feet deep and 100 feet wide from like depth in Pocomoke Sound through "The Muds" to deep water in the river near Williams Point, a distance of 3.5 miles; and a channel 9 feet deep and 100 to 130 feet wide from Shad Landing to above the bridge at Snow Hill widened to 150 feet to form a turning basin at the upper end, a distance of 4.5 miles. The project has been completed to Snow Hill.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel 11 feet deep and 150 feet wide from the 11-foot depth in Pocomoke Sound to Tulls Point, thence 100 feet wide to deep water in Pocomoke River above Williams Point, and construction of a dike along the offshore side of the channel between Tulls Point and the end of the existing dike.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$540,000	\$1,000	\$541,000
Current.....	678,300	1,100	679,400

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas, and hold and save the United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$21, 100	\$24, 100
Maintenance.....		
Total.....	21, 100	24, 100
Annual benefits:		
Savings in operating costs.....	3, 900	5, 070
Savings in cost of transportation of products.....	25, 800	31, 630
Total.....	29, 700	36, 700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.4	1.52

Remarks: Present project dimensions and conditions cause considerable delays to commercial craft visiting Pocomoke City and Snow Hill, and many of the craft can load to only partial capacity. The improvement would provide adequate depths and a more protected route for existing and prospective traffic, and is economically justified.

OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD.

(H. Doc. 444, 82d Cong.)

Location: Ocean City is on a narrow barrier beach between Sinepuxent Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, 105 miles north of the Virginia Capes.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for a navigable inlet between the Atlantic Ocean and Sinepuxent Bay, 10 by 200 feet, protected by jetties; a channel 10 by 100 by 3,000 feet from the inlet channel into the marsh area to form a harbor south of the railroad on the west side of Sinepuxent Bay with two turning basins; a channel 6 by 150 feet in Sinepuxent Bay from the inlet to Green Point, thence 100 feet wide to Chincoteague Bay; and a channel 6 by 125 feet from the inlet channel to a point opposite North Eighth Street in Ocean City, thence 75 feet wide into Isle of Wight Bay.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project by raising the north jetty to an elevation 9 feet above mean low water, and by providing a channel 16 by 300 feet from the ocean through the inlet to the Isle of Wight channel, thence 200 feet wide to the project harbor, and a depth of 14 feet in the project harbor.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$658, 000	-----	\$658, 000
Current.....	704, 000	-----	704, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; and, prior to construction, furnish assurances that adequate tank storage facilities at Ocean City for the handling of petroleum products will be installed and maintained.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$25,600	\$24,900
Maintenance.....	16,000	16,000
Total.....	41,600	40,900
Annual benefits:		
Increased fish catch.....	29,000	33,400
Transportation savings.....	21,600	24,940
Total.....	50,600	58,340
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.2	1.4

Remarks: The proposed improvement would provide a harbor of refuge for small craft in a 170-mile reach between Delaware Bay and Norfolk and would provide considerable time savings for the fishing fleets during winter season. The fishing fleet will be able to use larger boats with the new channel. Delivery of petroleum products will be possible at substantial savings.

PARROTTS CREEK, VA.

(H. Doc. 46, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Parrotts Creek, Va., is a small tidal estuary on the west bank of the Rappahannock River 23 miles upstream from Chesapeake Bay.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for an entrance channel 60 feet wide, suitably widened at the bends and 6 feet deep extending from that depth in Rappahannock River 4,800 feet to and including a turning basin of the same depth and 120 feet square opposite the (publie) wharf.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$29,600	\$4,000	\$33,600
Current.....	38,700	5,500	44,200

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and suitable spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; and construet and maintain a publie wharf, open to all on equal terms.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,425	\$1,655
Maintenance.....	2,525	3,035
Total.....	3,950	4,690
Annual benefits: Elimination of boat damages, lost working time, and increased production.....	6,550	7,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.66	1.64

Remarks: The shallow available depths in Parrotts Creek and the entrance restrict the movements of the larger fishing vessels and reduce the production of seafood, and hence the income of the fishermen in the vicinity. The recommended improvement would permit the larger boats to enter and reach the local packing plants at all stages of the tide, thereby reducing boat damages and delays, and increasing useful fishing time. Local interests agree to meet the proposed requirements of cooperation in a Federal project, which is considered to be economically justified.

NORFOLK HARBOR AND THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.

Location: Lower end of Chesapeake Bay near Norfolk, Va. Thimble Shoal Channel, in Chesapeake Bay extends from Atlantic Ocean to Hampton Roads; Norfolk Harbor extends from 40-foot contour in Hampton Roads up Elizabeth River.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Resolution June 17, 1949, and October 14, 1949.

Existing project: Federal: Thimble Shoal Channel, 40 by 750 feet, 11 miles long. Norfolk Harbor Channel 40 by 750 feet from Hampton Roads to Southern Branch, then 40 by 450 feet up branch to Belt Line Railroad bridge, 13.2 miles; thence 35 feet deep, 375 feet to 250 feet wide for 4.1 miles; several turning basins, anchorages, side channels, and a disposal area at Craney Island. *Non-Federal:* Numerous terminals, approach channels and berths.

Plan of recommended improvement: Thimble Shoal Channel: 40 by 1,000 feet with flank channel each side 32 by 450 feet. Norfolk Harbor: 40 by 1,500 feet, Hampton Roads to embarkation piers; and anchorage areas, south of Craney Island: 38 by 1,500 by 1,500 feet; 35 by 1,500 by 1,500 feet; and 20 by 1,000 by 3,000 feet, provided no work is accomplished until Craney Island disposal area is available.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project report.....	\$6, 138, 700	-----	\$6, 138, 700

Local cooperation: Virginia to extinguish at its expense all oyster rights.

Project economics:

Annual charges..... \$683, 819

Annual benefits and benefit-cost ratio not evaluated. River and Harbor Board notes that only 2 cents per ton of commerce required to justify work.

Remarks: The proposed improvements are warranted in order to provide for safe navigation by the increased number of larger commercial vessels and the many naval vessels using the projects. Although the benefits are not reducible to monetary terms, the costs are considered reasonable in view of the traffic involved.

DEEP CREEK, ACCOMACK COUNTY, VA.

(H. Doc. 477, 81st Cong.)

Location: A small stream about 7 miles long on the western side of the Delmarva Peninsula and about 50 miles north of Cape Charles, Va. The mean tidal range is 2.4 feet.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide a channel 7 by 75 feet and about 2.4 miles long from the 7-foot depth in Pocomoke Sound to and including a turning basin of like depth, 200 by 300 feet opposite the existing terminal facilities at the town of Deep Creek, Va.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$82,000	\$7,000	\$89,000
Current.....	95,000	8,600	103,600

Local cooperation: Provide all necessary land, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; remove the existing county wharf and all other structures within the limits of the channel and its side slopes; construct an adequate public landing; and hold and save the United States free from damages, including such damage as may occur to oyster beds.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$3,700	\$3,810
Maintenance.....	2,700	2,700
Total.....	6,400	6,510
Annual benefits:		
Transportation savings.....	6,200	7,425
Increased food production.....	3,000	3,600
Total.....	9,200	11,025
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.4	1.7

Remarks: Lack of adequate depths in Deep Creek prevents free navigation therein. The proposed improvement would increase fishing time and increased catch, with the probable new benefits expected in excess of the costs. The project is economically justified.

CHANNEL FROM OYSTER, VA., TO ATLANTIC OCEAN

(S. Doc. 49, 83d Cong.)

Location: Oyster, Va., is on lower east side of Delmarva Peninsula separating Chesapeake Bay from Atlantic Ocean.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, November 8, 1948.

Existing project: Channel 6 feet deep, 60 feet wide from deep water in Liscombes Channel to Oyster, Va., together with a turning basin 200 feet long and 125 feet wide. Completed, 1948.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel 6 feet deep and 80 feet wide from Liscombes Channel to Oyster and enlargement of turning basin to about 8 acres in area and 6 feet in depth.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$72,300	\$23,600	\$95,900
Current.....	75,200	25,600	100,800

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; provide land for public access to project; remove wrecks and other obstructions; hold and save United States free from damages; and establish a public body to regulate use of harbor facilities.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$3,815	\$3,585
Maintenance.....	4,280	4,600
Total.....	8,095	8,185
Annual benefits.....	33,075	39,764
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.10	4.86

Remarks: Project will provide substantial benefits to the seafood industry by eliminating the handicaps which reduce earning capacity, and by increasing the amount of seafood produced.

WALLACE CHANNEL, PAMLICO SOUND, N. C.

(H. Doc. 453, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Wallace Channel extends generally north from Ocracoke Inlet through an inner bar to a 15-foot depth in Pamlico Sound about 7.4 miles from the inlet. Wallace Channel is near the barrier reef and about 40 miles south and west of Cape Hatteras.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide in Wallace Channel from that depth in Ocracoke Inlet northwestward through the bar at the head of Wallace Channel to the 12-foot contour in Pamlico Sound.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$83,000	-----	\$83,000
Current.....	108,000	-----	108,000

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States free from claim for damage including such damage as may occur to public or leased oyster or clam beds.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization	\$3, 230	\$2, 810
Maintenance	15, 000	15, 000
Total	18, 230	17, 810
Annual benefits	61, 300	30, 450
Benefit-cost ratio	3.36	1.62

Remarks: Project serves a tributary area with a population of over 14,000. Project is justified by benefits to commercial fishing. Freight traffic through Wallace Channel totaled about 6,500 tons in 1952 as compared with almost 23,000 tons in 1948.

SMITHS CREEK, N. C.

(H. Doc. 170, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Smiths Creek, a nontidal stream about 2.5 miles long, rises in southeast Pamlico County, N. C., and flows generally south to Oriental, N. C., to its confluence with the Neuse River, 12 miles above Pamlico Sound.

Report authorized by: House River and Harbor Committee resolution, April 1, 1946.

Existing project: Authorized in 1910. Provides for a basin at Oriental with entrance channel from Neuse River, both 10 feet deep at mean low water. Project has been maintained at 150-foot width but width is not defined in previous authority.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification to provide a rubble-mound breakwater extending 800 feet southwesterly from Oriental, and a basin generally parallel to the breakwater, 10 feet deep, 300 feet wide, and 800 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document	\$97, 000	\$625	\$98, 525
Current	102, 000	700	102, 700

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and hold and save United States free from claim for damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges	\$4, 540	\$4, 370
Annual benefits	7, 795	7, 730
Benefit-cost ratio	1.73	1.77

Remarks: The benefits resulting from the elimination of damage to wharves are not included above.

HATTERAS INLET AND ROLLINSON CHANNELS, N. C.

(Chief of Engineers' report, November 2, 1953)

Location: Hatteras Inlet, a natural opening through the barrier island between Pamlico Sound and the Atlantic Ocean on the east coast of North Carolina, is about 13 miles southwest of Cape Hatteras. Town of Hatteras is on the sound shore of the island about 3.5 miles northeast of inlet. Englehard, N. C., the nearest town on the mainland, is at the head of Far Creek about 27 miles northwest across Pamlico Sound.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, June 19, 1945, and House public works resolution May 13, 1947.

Existing project: Federal—Rollinson Channel, 6 feet deep by 100 feet wide from Pamlico Sound to turning basin at Hatteras. *Non-Federal*—Channel dredging to wharves in Hatteras Harbor and other points within the harbor.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project for Rollinson Channel, N. C., to provide for a breakwater on each side of channel at entrance to basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$175,000	\$2,000	\$177,000
Current.....	175,000	2,000	177,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages due to construction and maintenance.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$6,250	\$6,250
Additional maintenance for breakwater.....	1,750	1,750
Total.....	8,000	8,000
Annual benefits:		
Prevention vessel damage.....	4,700	5,525
Increased fish catch.....	4,450	5,200
Total.....	9,150	10,725
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.14	1.34

Remarks: Report also considered 12-foot deep channel paralleling shore of Hatteras Island southwest to the inlet and other breakwater alignments at town of Hatteras, which were found not justified economically.

PELTIER CREEK, N. C.

(H. Doc. 379, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Tidal stream, about 5,000 feet long, tributary to Bogue Sound between Beaufort and Bogue Inlets and about 4 miles west of Morehead City, N. C.

Report authorized by: House River and Harbor Committee resolution, November 30, 1945.

Existing project: None for Peltier Creek; Intracoastal Waterway, passing through Bogue Sound, provides for 12-foot channel. Morehead City Harbor has a 30-foot channel, 400 feet wide across ocean bar and 300 feet wide inside.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel 1,850 feet long from Intracoastal Waterway, and 12 feet deep by 90 feet wide, with turning basin 200 feet by 600 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$32,000	\$1,250	\$33,250
Current.....	43,200	1,500	44,700

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas for construction and maintenance; hold and save United States free from damage; provide suitable area accessible by road for public landing.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,300	\$1,580
Maintenance.....	1,600	1,900
Total.....	2,900	3,480
Annual benefits: Elimination of boat damage (harbor of refuge).....	3,600	4,500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.24	1.29

Remarks: The improvement would provide suitable depths for larger craft as well as a harbor of refuge and the proposed depth is consistent with project depth on the Intracoastal Waterway. Project is economically justified as presented.

CHANNEL, PORT ROYAL SOUND TO BEAUFORT, S. C.

(H. Doc. 469, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Port Royal Sound, an arm of the Atlantic Ocean, in South Carolina, is 18 miles northwest of Savannah Harbor and 57 miles southwest of Charleston Harbor. Beaufort and Port Royal, S. C., are located near Beaufort River, a tributary of the sound.

Report authorized by River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None for Port Royal Sound. The Intracoastal Waterway, which has a project depth of 12 feet at mean low water, traverses that part of Beaufort River in which 24-foot improvement is desired.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provision of a channel, 27 feet deep by 500 feet wide, from the ocean across the bar to Port Royal Sound; and in Port Royal Sound, for approximately 13.2 miles; then 24 feet deep and 300 feet wide in Beaufort River and Battle Creek for approximately 7.5 miles to a turning basin 27 feet deep and 600 feet wide opposite the wharf of the Charleston and Western Carolina Railway, at Port Royal.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$600,000	-----	\$600,000
Current.....	765,000	-----	765,000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way and spoil disposal areas necessary for the construction and subsequent maintenance of the project, when and as required; hold and save the United States free from damages due to construction; and install and maintain without cost to the United States suitable additional terminal facilities as required.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$27,000	\$27,000
Maintenance.....	104,000	136,000
Total.....	131,000	163,000
Annual benefits: Transportation savings:		
Blackstrap molasses.....	-----	167,000
Fertilizers.....	-----	4,200
Lumber.....	-----	16,000
Total.....	¹ 156,600	187,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	¹ 1.20	1.15

¹ Based on anticipated benefits to Plywood Plastic Corp., which no longer expects to use the waterway.

Remarks: Expansion of the Plywood Plastics Corp. did not occur. As noted in the hearing testimony on February 9, 1954, the South Carolina States Ports Authority presented new information on commodities that would move through the proposed channel. The major item of commerce would be blackstrap molasses, the use of which in animal feeds is steadily increasing according to the Department of Agriculture, particularly in corn-deficient areas. The Chief of Engineers in letter June 15, 1954, confirmed the recommendation in the project document and furnished the current economic data shown above.

SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.

(H. Doc. 110, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Savannah Harbor is lower 21 miles of Savannah River below United States Highway 17 crossing, at Savannah, Ga.

Report authorized by House Public Works Committee resolution, April 25, 1951.

Existing project: Provides for channels 36 feet deep and 500 feet wide across ocean bar, 9.7 miles; then 34 feet deep and generally 400 feet wide, increasing to 550 feet wide, 17.2 miles, with turning basin 34 feet deep; then 30 feet deep and 300 feet wide to foot of Kings Island, 0.6 mile; thence 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide to a point 1,500 feet below U. S. 17 bridge with a turning basin 30 feet deep at upper end, 1.4 miles; a total of 31 miles of channel.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification to provide for a channel 34 feet deep and 400 feet wide from the upper end of the presently authorized 30-foot channel, a distance of 1.6 miles and for widening at the upper end to form a turning basin 34 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and 700 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$414,900	-----	\$414,900
Current.....	414,900	-----	414,900

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way and spoil disposal areas for the entire project for new work and maintenance; hold and save the United States free from claim for damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$16,100	\$14,700
Maintenance.....	(1)	(1)
Total.....	16,100	14,700
Annual benefits.....	20,600	22,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.28	1.50

¹ There is no increase in maintenance due to the self-sustaining nature of currents in the area of proposed improvement.

Remarks: The authorized 30-foot channel is inadequate for T-2 and other modern vessels expected to use the terminals of the Georgia Ports Authority. In 1952, commerce in the port area totaled over 3,500,000 tons. Port is served by 5 railroads and 51 steamship lines.

RICE CREEK, PUTNAM COUNTY, FLA.

(H. Doc. 446, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in northcentral Putnam County, Fla., flows easterly about 10 miles through generally low, swampy, and densely forested lands, and discharges into St. Johns River at a point 3.5 miles north of Palatka and 43 miles south of Jacksonville, Fla.

Report authorized by River and Harbor Act, July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide from beacon No. 64 in St. Johns River to mouth of Rice Creek, and thence 75 feet wide to the access channel of the Hudson Pulp & Paper Corp., except through the railroad and highway bridges, including a cut-off and suitable straightening, widening, and snagging.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$68, 150	\$69, 200	\$137, 350
Current.....	82, 200	83, 600	165, 800

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save United States free from damages; maintain access channel and turning basin at the paper mill to project depth; and contribute in cash 50 percent of the cost of construction.

Project economies:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$5, 900	\$5, 668
Maintenance.....	1, 090	850
Tax loss.....	10	12
Total.....	7, 000	6, 530
Annual benefits.....	23, 400	¹ 71, 300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3. 58	10. 2

¹ Results primarily from commerce increasing 2.5 times since preparation of report.

Remarks: The benefits resulting from provision of the project are largely local in nature and would accrue principally to one company. However, in view of this situation, local interests are required to contribute in cash 50 percent of the cost of constructing the channel.

HILLSBORO RIVER, FLA.

(H. Doc. 567, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises near Dade City, Pasco County, Fla., and flows about 51 miles southwesterly to Hillsboro Bay at Tampa, Fla.

Report authorized by: Review resolutions adopted March 18, and December 4, 1946, by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for improvement of Hillsboro River for flood control. The existing navigation project for Tampa Harbor provides, among other things, for a deep-water channel from the Gulf of Mexico to and including a turning basin at the mouth of Hillsboro River, thence a channel in Hillsboro River 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide to a point about 100 feet below the Lafayette Street Bridge, a distance of 2,400 feet, thence 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide for an additional 2.4 miles to a point 2,000 feet upstream from Columbus Drive, and for clearing the channel thence to the Florida Avenue Bridge at river mile 8.0.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for Tampa Harbor, Fla., to provide for removal of snags, wrecks, piling, and similar obstructions from the channel of Hillsboro River between the upstream end of the existing project at the Florida Avenue Bridge and the city waterworks dam.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$14, 400	-----	\$14, 400
Current.....	16, 560	-----	16, 560

Local cooperation: Provide without cost all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make all necessary alterations to structures and utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain the cleared channel after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$1, 060	\$1, 125
Annual benefits.....	\$2, 200	\$2, 730
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.08	2.43

Remarks: Improvement of Hillsboro River for flood control only is not warranted. However, completion of the existing navigation project for Tampa Harbor, of which Hillsboro River is a part, will materially reduce flood damages in Tampa, and the proposed extension by snagging above the project limits would return additional flood-control benefits in excess of the costs.

APALACHICOLA BAY, FLA.

(H. Doc. 156, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Apalachicola Bay, St. George and St. Vincent Sounds, form a continuous body of water about 54 miles long and 7 miles wide on the gulf coast of Florida about 190 miles northwest of Tampa, and is separated from the gulf by several low islands. The town of Apalachicola is on the west bank of the Apalachicola River which enters Apalachicola Bay at its junction with its branch, East Bay. The village of Eastpoint is on the north shore of St. George Sound at its junction with Apalachicola and East Bays.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None for Eastpoint or Apalachicola. The existing project for Apalachicola Bay provides for 10-foot depths in West Pass, and in Link and Inner Bar Channels, and for a 9-foot depth in East Pass Channel (Bulkhead Shoals).

Plan of recommended improvement: At Eastpoint, Fla., a main channel 6 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and about 6,000 feet long, generally parallel to the shore, with a channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide connecting the center of the main channel with water of the same depth in St. George Sound. At Apalachicola, a small-boat basin 500 feet square and 9 feet deep with a connecting channel 9 feet deep and 80 feet wide through Scipio Creek to the Apalachicola River.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$88,800	\$10,000	\$98,800
Current.....	98,000	12,500	110,500

Local cooperation: Provide and maintain the necessary slips; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil-disposal areas; provide and maintain adequate mooring facilities, a public landing, and other appurtenant works including necessary bulkheads and slips for local boats; and establish a competent and properly constituted public body empowered to regulate the use, growth, and free development of the harbor facilities.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Eastpoint.....	\$6,600	\$7,760
Apalachicola.....	4,900	4,940
Annual benefits:		
Eastpoint.....	17,900	13,600
Apalachicola.....	6,600	7,200
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Eastpoint.....	2.71	1.75
Apalachicola.....	1.34	1.46

Remarks: (a) Eastpoint: Improvement would permit the use of larger fishing vessels and would result in increased seafood production and greater economy of operation. Improved navigation conditions would decrease damage to boats. (b) Apalachicola: Improvement would relieve congested conditions on the waterfront and would provide a harbor of refuge during storms for the numerous fishing vessels operating in the vicinity.

APALACHICOLA BAY, FLA.—CHANNEL ACROSS ST. GEORGE ISLAND

(H. Doc. 557, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Apalachicola Bay is on the gulf coast of Florida, 190 miles northwest of Tampa. The bay and connecting sounds, St. George Sound on the east and St. Vincent Sound on the west, form a continuous body of water separated from the Gulf of Mexico by St. Vincent, St. George, and Dog Islands.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, April 29, 1937.

Existing project: Provides for channels 10 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico through West Pass and in Link and Inner Bar Channels in Apalachicola Bay, with widths of 150 feet in West Pass and Link Channels and 100 feet in Inner Bar Channel. It also provides for a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide through Bulkhead Shoal, which serves as another entrance to the bay through East Pass, the entrance to Carrabelle Harbor.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for modification of the existing project to provide for a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

from the 10-foot depth in Apalachicola Bay across St. George Island to within 300 feet of the gulf shore, thence increasing uniformly in width to 200 feet at the shore and continuing with this width to the 10-foot depth in the Gulf of Mexico, and for 2 jetties extending from the dune line on St. George Island to the 10-foot depth in the Gulf of Mexico.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$428,700	\$3,000	\$431,700
Current.....	635,700	3,000	638,700

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas, and hold and save the United States free from damages, including damages to oyster beds.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$32,600	\$43,300
Annual benefits.....	40,070	47,300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.23	1.09

ST. JOSEPH BAY, FLA.

(H. Doc. 595, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: St. Joseph Bay is on northwest coast of Florida, 115 miles east of Pensacola Harbor. It is 13 miles long north to south and averages 4 miles wide, and is partially enclosed by a long, narrow peninsula connected to the mainland at the south. The bay is connected to the gulf by an opening 3 miles wide. Port St. Joe is on the mainland shore of the bay.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for an entrance channel 32 feet deep, 300 feet wide, and about 6 miles long across the outer shoal; a north bay (inner) channel 32 feet deep, 200 feet wide, and about 2 miles long, leading to a turning basin 32 feet deep, about 1,000 feet wide, and 2,000 feet long at the Port St. Joe waterfront; and a south bay (inner) channel 27 feet deep and 200 feet wide. Completed February 1949.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provide for an entrance channel 37 feet deep, 500 feet wide at its outer end and diminishing progressively in width to 400 feet at the first bend, thence 400 feet wide to the entrance to St. Joseph Bay; a north channel in the bay 35 feet deep and 300 feet wide; and a harbor channel in the turning basin 35 feet deep and 250 feet wide, with its shoreward edge 100 feet from and parallel to the face of the existing wharf.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,125,000	-----	\$1,125,000
Current.....	1,312,000	-----	1,312,000

Local cooperation: Furnish all spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; and provide and maintain adequate depths between the docks and the edge of the proposed channel as may be required by shipping.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$75,800	\$99,400
Annual benefits, transportation savings.....	80,000	124,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.05	1.25

Remarks: The existing project is inadequate for full capacity loading of T-2 tankers. Modification would permit the larger tankers to load to capacity and thereby effect substantial savings in transportation costs of petroleum products, the major item of commerce at Port St. Joe.

MOBILE HARBOR, ALA.

(H. Doc. 74, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In city of Mobile, in southwestern Alabama, on the west bank of Mobile River at its mouth.

Reported authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, September 27, 1951.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 36 by 450 feet across Mobile Bar; a 32 by 300-foot channel from bay entrance to mouth of Mobile River; channel 32 by 500 feet to 775 feet to highway bridge at mile 4.6; 25-foot channel in Chickasaw Creek; 27-foot channel in vicinity of Garrows Bend; turning basin; and other appurtenant works.

Plan of recommended improvement: Enlarging bar channel to 42 by 600 feet; enlarging Mobile Bay channel to 40 by 400 feet; deepen Mobile River channel from mouth to highway bridge; deepen turning basin to 40 feet; widening river channel to 800 feet to provide turning basin 40 feet deep by 1,400 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$5,778,000	\$143,000	\$5,971,000
Current.....	5,778,000	143,000	5,971,000

Local cooperation: Furnish spoil-disposal areas; provide suitable depths in berthing areas at terminals; hold and save United States from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$232,700	\$210,500
Maintenance.....	302,000	302,000
Total.....	534,700	512,500
Annual benefits: Transportation; reduction in accidents.....	1,565,000	1,419,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.93	2.77

Remarks: Sixty ships were involved in collisions from 1946 to 1951. Ships drag bottom even at reasonable speeds.

DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, ALA.

(H. Doc. 394, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Dauphin Island Bay, Ala., a shallow inlet about three-fourths mile wide and 1.75 miles long, is on the mainland side of the eastern end of Dauphin Island which is one of the barrier islands along the gulf coast west of the entrance to Mobile Bay.

Report authorized by: Resolutions of the Public Works Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, adopted February 25, and June 2, 1949, respectively.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 7 feet deep and 150 feet wide from that depth in Mobile Bay to an anchorage basin of the same depth, 600 feet long and 500 feet wide, just north of Fort Gaines, and a channel 4 feet deep and 40 feet wide from the anchorage basin to the 3-foot contour in Dauphin Island Bay, together with a jetty to protect the entrance channel on the north. No work has been done on the existing project.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for an anchorage basin 7 feet deep and 500 feet square at Dauphin Island village, with an entrance channel of like depth 100 feet wide and about 8,300 feet long extending to the 7-foot contour in Mississippi Sound.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$56,000	-----	\$56,000
Current.....	70,000	-----	70,000

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable spoil-disposal areas; provide and maintain a suitable landing open to all on equal terms; and hold and save the United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$8,900	\$10,800
Annual benefits.....	20,800	20,800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.34	1.93

Remarks: The benefits would accrue principally to owners and operators of small commercial fishing craft who earn a livelihood by fishing, shrimping, and oystering in the waters adjacent to Dauphin Island.

BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA.

(H. Doc. 413, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: In lowlands of Jefferson Parish just south of the Mississippi River opposite New Orleans.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, March 12, 1946; River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946; Flood

Control Act of December 22, 1944; River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provision of a channel with depth of 9 feet below mean low gulf level and bottom width of 60 feet, extending from Company Canal at Westwego, La., to the Gulf Intra-coastal Waterway via Bayou Segnette, a land cut, and Bayou Villars.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$520,000	\$64,000	\$584,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; accomplish and maintain necessary alterations in pipelines, drainage, and other facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain Company Canal free from vegetative growth obstructive to navigation and provide and maintain therein a minimum of 7 feet or depth equivalent to that maintained in Federal channel, for width of 30 feet; provide and maintain public wharf; cooperate in preventing vegetative growth from entering proposed improvement.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$33,970	\$33,970
Annual benefits.....	46,400	46,400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.37	1.37

Remarks: It is recommended that channel be maintained to 6-foot depth at estimated cost of \$8,000 annually until such time as greater depth up to 9 feet is economically advisable.

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TEX.

(S. Doc. 80, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Gulf of Mexico to cities of Port Arthur, Beaumont, and Orange in southeastern part of Texas.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project: Provides channel from Gulf of Mexico, northward through Sabine Pass, past Port Arthur, to Beaumont, and a channel from the mouth of the Neches to Orange, Tex.; an anchorage basin and various turning basins. Depths vary from 30 feet to 37 feet, widths from 800 feet at the outer bar to 125 feet in Sabine River.

Plan of recommended improvement: Rectification and curve widening of channels, relocation and enlargement of anchorage basin; provision of maneuvering basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$6, 875, 000	\$261, 000	\$7, 136, 000
Current.....	6, 875, 000	261, 000	7, 136, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and spoil-disposal areas; relocate and alter existing pipelines, utility crossings, piers and wharves; hold and save United States from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$288, 200	\$261, 000
Maintenance.....	121, 000	121, 000
Total.....	409, 200	382, 000
Annual benefits: Transportation.....	506, 000	446, 900
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.2	1.2

Remarks: Major industry in tributary area is the petroleum industry. Principal items of prospective commerce at Orange will be from the chemical industry.

GUADALUPE RIVER AT SEADRIFT, TEX.

(H. Doc. 478, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On northeastern shore of San Antonio Bay about 60 miles northeast of Corpus Christi, and 35 miles from the Gulf of Mexico.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted February 15, 1946.

Existing project: Provides channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway by way of Seadrift to Guadalupe River 3 miles above Victoria; side channel about 6 miles long to connect with turning basin to be constructed by local interests at Seadrift.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provide harbor of refuge for small craft at Seadrift 9 feet deep, 200 feet wide, and 1,000 feet long with entrance channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$52, 000	\$21, 000	\$73, 000
Current.....	74, 300	28, 500	102, 800

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States from damage; provide and maintain mooring facilities and public landing open to all on equal terms.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$2,900	\$3,620
Maintenance.....	2,100	2,500
Total.....	5,000	6,120
Annual benefits: Prevention of damages.....	10,000	9,760
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.00	1.6

Remarks: Chief of Engineers recommends that construction of the proposed work not be undertaken until authorized Guadalupe River channel and side channel have been completed.

GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ARANSAS PASS, TEX.

(H. Doc. 376, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: South Texas coast of Gulf of Mexico about 20 miles northeast of Corpus Christi.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, September 29, 1949.

Existing project: Tributary channel of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway project extending from Port Aransas to city of Aransas Pass. Provides for channel 12 feet deep and 100 feet wide with turning basin 12 feet deep, 300 feet wide, and 2,200 feet long.

Plan of recommended improvement: Widen tributary channel to 125 feet; straighten and widen connecting channel to Conn Brown Harbor and maintenance by the United States of Conn Brown Harbor.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$29,000		\$29,000
Current.....	30,700		30,700

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save United States free from damages; maintain embankment at Conn Brown Harbor.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,300	\$1,400
Maintenance.....	2,180	2,180
Total.....	3,480	3,580
Annual benefits.....	5,500	4,740
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.6	1.3

TURTLE COVE, TEX.

(H. Doc. 654, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On Texas coast about 180 miles southwest of Galveston, Tex.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946.

Existing project: Provides deep-water channel from Gulf of Mexico through Aransas Pass, Turtle Cove, and Corpus Christi Bay to city of Corpus Christi; channel to vicinity of Tule Lake; channel to town of Port Aransas; turning basins at Corpus Christi at Avery Point, and near Tule Lake; inner basin at Harbor Island.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provide anchorage basin 12 feet deep, from 300 to 500 feet wide, and 900 feet long in Turtle Cove adjacent to existing channel and turning basin at Port Aransas.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$30,000	-----	\$30,000
Current.....	40,000	-----	40,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save United States from damage; provide and maintain mooring facilities and public landing open to all on equal terms.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,207	\$1,430
Maintenance.....	1,000	1,020
Total.....	2,207	2,450
Annual benefits: Transportation savings; harbor of refuge.....	8,000	7,740
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3.6	3.2

Remarks: Use of proposed basin would save distance of 12 miles or approximately 2 hours of travel time, and would provide anchorage during storm periods.

PORT ARANSAS-CORPUS CHRISTI WATERWAY (VICINITY OF LA QUINTA)

(H. Doc. 89, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Gulf of Mexico to ports of Harbor Island, and Corpus Christi. Gulf entrance is 170 miles southwest of Galveston, Tex., and 140 miles north of Brownsville, Tex.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, adopted February 20, 1951.

Existing project: Provides deep water channel from Gulf of Mexico through Aransas Pass, Turtle Cove, and Corpus Christi Bay to city of Corpus Christi; channel to vicinity of Tule Lake; channel to town of Port Aransas; turning basins at Corpus Christi, at Avery Point, and near Tule Lake; inner basin at Harbor Island.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provide for branch channel 32 feet deep and 150 feet wide extending northerly from the main channel near Port Ingleside, along north shore of Corpus Christi Bay to the Reynolds Metals Co. plant, and for turning basin 32 feet deep and 800 feet square near the plant.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$795,000	\$825,000	\$1,620,000
Current.....	829,100	859,100	1,688,200

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save United States from damage; contribute in cash 50 per cent of cost, presently estimated at \$829,100.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$57,800	\$60,200
Maintenance.....	40,000	42,500
Total.....	97,800	102,700
Annual benefits: Transportation.....	238,500	203,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.38	2.0

Remarks: Channel to La Quinta has been dredged by Reynolds Metals Co. substantially according to plan recommended by Chief of Engineers. Work already done by local interests, in accordance with recommended plan, may be credited to cash contributions required of local interests.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT LOUISIANA, MO.

(H. Doc. 251, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On the west bank of the Mississippi River about 64 miles above the mouth of the Illinois River.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee, April 13, 1948.

Existing project: Lock and dam No. 24 of the 9-foot Mississippi navigation project at Clarksville, Mo., is 10 miles downstream from Louisiana. The pool of this dam has raised the average elevation of the Mississippi River at Louisiana 7.5 feet.

Plan of recommended improvement: If reimbursement is to be made the amount shall be \$57,829.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$57,829	-----	\$57,829
Current.....	82,600	-----	82,600

Remarks: Local interests allege that since creation of pool No. 24 the main sanitary sewers of the city which discharge into the Mississippi are blocked to such a degree that basements are flooded and man-holes are blown off, and they desired remedial measures. The amount of funds indicated above are as near as can be estimated the exact damages and payment is subject to releasing the United States from any further claims or duplication of claims resulting from operation of the navigation project.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT CHESTER, ILL.

(H. Doc. 230, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On the left bank of the Mississippi River 110 miles above the mouth of the Ohio River.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee, July 10, 1946.

Existing project: No Federal project for harbor at Chester.

Plan of recommended improvement: A small-boat harbor opposite Chester, consisting of a basin 6 feet deep with approach channel same depth, 50 feet wide, and 1,200 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$57,700	\$58,700	\$116,400
Current.....	65,000	65,500	130,500

Local cooperation: Furnish lands; non-self-liquidating items; make cash contribution one-third the cost presently estimated to be \$32,600; hold and save United States free of damages; establish a body to control the project.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$5,099	\$4,584
Maintenance.....	2,500	3,200
Total.....	7,599	7,784
Annual benefits: Recreational boating.....	8,540	9,664
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.12	1.24

Remarks: Project will provide a safe adequate harbor for 150 recreational craft. Chester has a population of more than 5,000 and some manufacturing. Recreational benefits require cash contribution by local interests.

CROOKED SLOUGH HARBOR AT WINONA, MINN.

(H. Doc. 347, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On the Mississippi River about 100 miles south of St. Paul, Minn.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 22, 1947.

Existing project: A combination commereial and small-boat harbor authorized by the 1945 River and Harbor Act which was modified to relocate the small-boat harbor. The Mississippi River navigation project provides 9-foot navigation by a system of locks and dams.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for 9-foot channel from Mississippi River into Crooked Slough 6,000 feet long and 200 feet wide in lieu of the project authorized in the 1945 River and Harbor Act.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$138,800	\$83,500	\$222,300
Current.....	142,000	86,500	228,500

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free of damages; provide adequate terminal and unloading facilities; make a cash contribution estimated at \$3,300.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$7,830	\$8,010
Maintenance.....	1,800	1,800
Total.....	9,630	9,810
Annual benefits: Transportation savings.....	39,300	40,500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.08	4.13

Remarks: Winona is a manufacturing center, chiefly agriculture products, with a population of more than 25,000; commerce in recent years has averaged 184,000 tons annually, consisting of coal, petroleum, grain, phosphates, and miscellaneous.

CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY. AND TENN.

(S. Doc. 81, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Cumberland River is formed by the confluence of Poor and Clover Forks near Harlan, Ky. It flows in a generally westerly direction to its junction with the Ohio River in pool No. 52 near Smithland, Ky.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, July 31, 1951.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 9 feet deep from mouth of Cumberland River to Nashville by construction of 3 moderate-height dams to replace 7 low-head outmoded structures that provide a channel 6 feet deep.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project for navigation to provide, in lieu of the authorized moderate height dams at Eureka and Dover, for the construction of a multiple-purpose project for navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power consisting of a high dam, lock, and powerplant near mile 30.5 on the lower Cumberland River, and a canal connecting the proposed reservoir with the reservoir at Kentucky Dam on the Tennessee River.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$145,000,000	-----	\$145,000,000
Current.....	161,340,000	-----	161,340,000

Local cooperation: None required.*Project economics:*

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$6,144,000	\$6,115,000
Maintenance.....	433,000	482,000
Total.....	6,577,000	6,597,000
Annual benefits:		
Navigation.....	2,911,000	3,239,000
Flood control.....	2,000,000	2,300,000
Power.....	4,183,000	3,909,000
Total.....	9,094,000	9,448,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.38	1.43

Remarks: This multiple-purpose project in the interest of power, flood control, and navigation will replace two medium-size navigation dams now authorized for improvement of the same area in the lower Cumberland River. These two dams are currently estimated to cost \$36 million. Originally the Corps of Engineers proposed a multiple-purpose dam substantially as now recommended, but the two navigation dams were adopted instead in 1946 as a result of opposition of the States of Kentucky and Tennessee. In the intervening period, the States have changed their position and now favor the maximum development of the resources of the river in order to provide additional navigation benefits through the linking of the Kentucky and Tennessee systems by a canal across the divide to the Kentucky Reservoir on the Tennessee, by provision of flood-control storage which will contribute to Mississippi and lower Ohio River flood control, and by the provision of hydroelectric power at lower cost than can be furnished from other developments, either steam or hydroelectric, in this area. The committee heard considerable testimony, favorable to the project. Although the cost of this individual project is high, the benefits are also very great and the committee considers that it would be shortsighted to build the lower-cost navigation structures and thereby permanently preclude taking advantage of the hydroelectric potential and the flood-control potentialities on this important waterway.

GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.

(S. Doc. 82, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Green River rises in Lincoln County, Ky., and flows 370 miles westerly and northwesterly into Ohio River about 8 miles above Evansville, Ind. Barren River rises in Monroe County, Ky., and flows northwesterly to join Green River at mile 149.5.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolutions, April 15, 1949, and December 10, 1952.

Existing project: Provides for locks and dams Nos. 1 through 6 on Green River, lock and dam No. 1 on Barren River, and improvement of Nolin River and Bear Creek by removal of obstructions. Controlling depth is 5.5 feet from Ohio River to Bowling Green at mile 30.1 on Barren River. Channel is generally 200 feet wide on lower Green River and 100 feet wide on upper Green and Barren Rivers. Replacement of locks and dams Nos. 1 and 2 on Green River recently has been approved under authority of the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1909.

Plan of recommended improvement: Deepen and widen Green River between mouth and mile 103 to 9 feet by 200 feet, suitable widening at bends, and construct guide fenders and cells at 4 bridges.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,310,000	-----	\$3,310,000
Current.....	3,434,000	-----	3,434,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$119,600	\$124,000
Maintenance.....	25,000	25,000
Total.....	144,600	149,000
Annual benefits: Transportation.....	260,000	266,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.8	1.8

Remarks: Transportation benefits are conservatively estimated from prospective movement of coal, most of which is already under contract for shipment by river after improvement. This coal is destined for a powerplant to serve the AEC as well as for a TVA plant.

KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MINN.

(H. Doc. 463, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: North shore Lake Superior, 19 miles northeast of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn.-Wis.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 17, 1949.

Existing project: Provides for a flared approach channel 12 feet deep and 60 feet wide; and inner entrance channel 10 feet deep and 60 feet wide and 100 feet long; and 2 inner channels 8 feet deep and 60 feet wide with combined length of 850 feet. Project has not been constructed.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a breakwater at entrance to harbor, spending beach, rearrangement of channels and reduction of depth and width to generally 8 feet deep and 50 feet wide.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Current.....	\$219, 900	\$17, 700	\$237, 600

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements and rights-of-way, spoil areas and hold and save the United States free of damages.

Project economics:

	<i>Current</i>
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization.....	\$10, 000
Maintenance.....	2, 500
Total.....	12, 500
Annual benefits: Increased fish catch and recreational boating.....	22, 600
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 81

Remarks: Residents of the village of Knife River are largely dependent for livelihood on commercial fishing. Improvement would provide a protected harbor for craft based in the vicinity.

CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WIS.

(H. Doc. 434, 83d Cong.; 2d sess.)

Location: South shore Lake Superior, 49 miles east of Duluth Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Public Works resolution adopted April 13, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for entrance channel in Siskiwit River 50 feet wide, 10 feet deep between piers from Siskiwit Bay to a turning basin; and 2 inner channels 50 feet wide, 8 feet deep extending to form a Y with length of 150 and 300 feet.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for reconstruction and Federal maintenance of entrance piers, including 25-foot extension of west pier and extension of westerly channel for a distance of 300 feet at a depth of 8 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$220, 000	\$7, 000	\$227, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands including necessary building removals; hold and save the United States free of damages; provide and maintain a public wharf; establish a public body to regulate the harbor.

Project economics:

	<i>Project document</i>
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization.....	\$8, 000
Maintenance.....	400
Total.....	8, 400
Annual benefits: Fish catch and recreational boating.....	\$28, 100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3. 35

Remarks: Commercial fishing is the main industry at Cornucopia. Fish catch amounted to 858 tons in 1952. The recommended work is necessary if the harbor is to reasonably serve the needs of commercial fishing and other boating activities of the area.

SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WIS.

(H. Doc. 554, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: West shore of Lake Michigan, 55 miles north of Milwaukee.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, October 15, 1949.

Existing project: Provides for an outer harbor formed by breakwaters with basin project depth of 21 feet and a channel into Sheboygan River for about 500 feet, 200 feet wide, and 21 feet deep.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for 450-foot width at lakeward end of entrance channel, extension of the 25-foot and 21-foot channels, and a 15-foot channel with varying width from Maryland Avenue to Jefferson Avenue.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$199,100	\$75,000	\$274,100
Current.....	217,200	80,000	297,200

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States from damage; make available area for unloading bulk petroleum carriers.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$10,940	
Maintenance.....	8,330	
Total.....	19,270	\$20,080
Annual benefits: Transportation.....	37,500	49,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.95	=2.44

Remarks: Sheboygan is a manufacturing center; has a population of more than 42,000. Commerce has averaged more than 500,000 tons in the last 10 years. Project is amply justified by savings in transportation costs.

HOLLAND HARBOR AND BLACK LAKE, MICH.

(H. Doc. 282, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: In Black Lake on eastern shore of Lake Michigan about 95 miles northeast of Chicago, Ill.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Public Works Resolution, April 13, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for jettied channel in Lake Michigan into Black Lake to turning basin at Holland about 5.5 miles long, average width of 150 feet with depth from 21 to 22 feet.

Plan of recommended improvement: Widen the entrance channel from 130 to 235 feet; new revetment; channel extension and turning basin enlargement at head of navigation by deepening to 18 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$560,600	\$37,400	\$598,000
Current.....	574,400	37,400	611,800

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, rights-of-way, and disposal areas; remove buildings; hold and save the United States free of damages. Contribute in cash 25 percent of the cost of dredging section B, but not to exceed \$45,500.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Part A.....	\$5,270	\$4,750
Part B.....	13,200	12,310
Total.....	18,470	17,060
Annual benefits:		
Part A.....	6,000	7,000
Part B.....	18,300	22,670
Total.....	24,300	29,670
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Part A.....	1.14	1.47
Part B.....	1.39	1.84

Remarks: Holland is an industrial center with a population of almost 18,000. Commerce in 1948 was 236,000 tons and in 1952 was 247,000 tons.

Local interests offered to contribute 25 percent of the cost, not to exceed \$45,500, of dredging section B. This local cooperation is in addition to that required by the project document.

CROOKED AND INDIAN RIVERS, MICH.

(H. Doc. 142, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Connecting channels known as inland route in the northern tip of the lower Peninsula of Michigan. Extends from Conway on Lake Michigan to Cheboygan on Lake Huron.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, October 19, 1945.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for the waterway except at Cheboygan harbor. Emergency clearing of the project performed under the authority contained in section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Plan of recommended improvement: To provide a channel 5 feet deep and 30 feet wide in the waterway with jetties at head of Indian River and in Pickerel Channel.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$150,850	\$85,000	\$235,850
Current.....	225,000	85,000	310,000

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States from damages; establish public body to control the project; provide and maintain certain navigation facilities; operate navigation lock in Cheboygan River; contribute in cash 36 percent of the cost of construction.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$12,465	\$14,960
Maintenance.....	3,000	3,000
Total.....	15,465	17,960
Annual benefits: Recreational boating.....	22,555	28,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.4	1.57

Remarks: The project will permit 165 craft to use the waterway from Conway to Lake Huron. Frequent damage to craft and other losses are caused by many obstructions in the waterway.

TOLEDO HARBOR, OHIO

(H. Doc. 620, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Westerly end of Lake Erie.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, July 23, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 25 feet deep about 16.5 miles long, generally 500 feet wide, from Lake Erie to Maumee River; for a dike in the channel for foundation for range lights; and a channel of varying depths and widths in Maumee River.

Plan of recommended improvement: Removal of the center dike on which range lights are located, to a depth of 25 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$420,000		\$420,000
Current.....	512,000		512,000

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States free from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$29,050	\$32,000
Maintenance.....	-2,750	-3,400
Total.....	26,300	28,600
Annual benefits: Savings due to prevention of accidents and time lost in navigating channel.....	46,000	58,400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.8	2.0

Remarks: Toledo has a population of more than 300,000; it is an important industrial center and point of transfer of freight between lake boats and railroad lines. Commerce has averaged more than 28 million tons annually. The dike is a hazard to the more than 15,000 vessels that use the harbor each year.

ERIE HARBOR, PA.

(H. Doc. 345, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: South shore of Lake Erie 78 miles west of Buffalo, N. Y.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, March 15, 1949.

Existing project: Provides for entrance piers and channel 300 feet to 500 feet wide, 25 feet deep; approach channel to ore docks same depth, 600 feet wide; harbor area 117 acres, 21 feet deep; approach channel 23 feet deep and 300 feet wide to westerly docks and turning basin.

Plan of recommended improvement: Widening the 25-foot approach channel to ore dock to 1,200 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$154,000	-----	\$154,000
Current.....	174,000	-----	174,000

Local cooperation: Hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$5,400	\$6,100
Annual benefits: Transportation.....	9,300	11,100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.7	1.82

Remarks: Project serves an important industrial center with a population of 131,000. Commerce in the harbor for the past 10 years has averaged more than 7,800,000 tons.

BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 423, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: In Niagara River, extending from Lake Erie at Buffalo Harbor downstream 13.5 miles to North Tonawanda.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution adopted November 29, 1946.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 21 feet deep from Buffalo Harbor north entrance channel to and including the turning basin of that depth, at North Tonawanda; the ship lock; a bascule highway bridge across Black Rock Canal at Ferry Street, Buffalo; repair and extension of Bird Island pier; removal of rock shoals depth of 22 feet; a channel 16 feet deep, 6,800 feet long, and generally 400 feet wide in Tonawanda Inner Harbor; and a channel 16 feet deep, 1,400 feet long, and generally 180 feet wide in Tonawanda Creek. The project width of Black Rock Channel is a maximum of 1,000 feet at the flared entrance from the lake, thence decreases irregularly to 200 feet in a distance of 4,700 feet, and continues at that general width to the lock. Between the lock and turning basin the project width is 400 feet except for widening to 500 feet at a bend.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for deepening of the lower 1,500 feet of Tonawanda inner harbor and minor enlargement of the turning basin, all to depth of 21 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$270, 000	\$265, 500	\$535, 500

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain suitable depth between the Federal channel and adjacent terminals.

Project economics:

	<i>Project document</i>
Annual charges:	
Amortization and interest.....	\$21, 300
Maintenance.....	3, 000
Total.....	24, 300
Annual benefits: Savings in transportation costs.....	103, 800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4. 27

Remarks: Prospective benefits economically justify the expenditures on the proposed work. The project will permit vessels loaded to deeper drafts to serve the terminals and will facilitate maneuvering of vessels at terminals adjacent to the turning basin.

LITTLE RIVER AT CAYUGA ISLAND, NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 246, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Lies entirely within the city limits of Niagara Falls, about 1½ miles long and is a branch of the Niagara River.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel 8 feet deep; width from 50 to 200 feet, about 1,000 feet long from Niagara River into lower end of Little River.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$29,100	\$57,000	\$86,100
Current.....	36,900	70,100	107,000

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash 55 percent of the cost estimated at \$45,100 (October 1953 prices); furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free of damages; provide mooring facilities and public landing open to all on equal terms; establish a public body to regulate the harbor and prevent discharge of sewage into Cayuga Creek.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$5,400	\$5,900
Annual benefits: Recreational boating.....	16,700	27,800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3.09	4.71

Remarks: The project will provide access to and full utilization of the facilities in Little River and Cayuga Creek for recreational craft. Local interests' expenditures will be nearly twice the Federal.

OSWEGO HARBOR, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 487, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: At mouth of Oswego River on south shore of Lake Ontario, 59 miles east of Rochester, N. Y.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945.

Existing project: Provides, in part, for maintenance of 145 feet of the west inner breakwater; an outer west breakwater 4,478 feet long; an arrowhead rubble-mound breakwater system, and other appurtenant works including dredging to various depths and widths with deep draft channels at 21-foot depth.

Plan of recommended improvement: Detached breakwater 850 feet long at harbor entrance and removal of shoals to a depth of 25 feet in the approach to the entrance of the harbor.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,811,000	-----	\$1,811,000
Current.....	2,459,000	-----	2,459,000

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$70, 600	\$87, 200
Maintenance.....	5, 000	6, 300
Total.....	75, 600	93, 500
Annual benefits:		
Reduction in lost time.....	58, 000	
Reduction in damages.....	24, 800	
Total.....	82, 800	119, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 09	1. 27

Remarks: Project serves the area of Oswego County with population of about 77,000. Waterborne commerce into the harbor has averaged more than 2 million tons during the past 10 years, and amounted to 3 million tons in 1951. Harbor is exposed to storms from west and north which has caused damage to docks, delays in unloading, loss of cargo, and difficulty of maneuvering into slips.

LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 161, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors are on San Pedro Bay on the coast of southern California. The business center of Los Angeles is about 23 miles north of the general harbor area.

Report authorized by: Resolutions of the House Committees on Rivers and Harbors and Public Works, adopted February 1, 1946 and February 17, 1950, respectively.

Existing project: Provides for San Pedro breakwater extending 11,152 feet from Point Fermin; a detached middle breakwater 18,500 feet long; a detached outer Long Beach breakwater 13,350 feet long; maintenance of original Long Beach inner breakwater; and Los Angeles outer harbor entrance channel 40 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide, together with a turning basin, anchorage areas, and other appropriate works of various widths and depths.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a depth of 35 feet over an area of about 80 acres in East Basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$896, 500	\$306, 000	\$1, 202, 500
Current.....	896, 500	306, 000	1, 202, 500

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide terminal and transfer facilities; alter sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities; remove and relocate existing small-boat facilities in East Basin and disestablish special anchorage area A-4 prior to improvement of East Basin.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$46,400	\$47,600
Annual benefits:		
Reduced vessel delays.....	48,400	48,400
Reduced piloting and towage charges.....	53,000	53,000
Total.....	101,400	101,400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.2	2.1

Remarks: In view of the urgency of this project, local interests undertook dredging of East Basin in April of 1953, and by July of that year had completed about 60 percent of the project. This work was sufficient for the immediate use of the new terminal which had previously been constructed by local interests. It is estimated that local interests have performed work in the amount of \$500,000. This work was accomplished in accordance with the plans recommended in the report. This leaves an amount of \$396,500 to be done by the Federal Government, in addition to maintaining the project.

PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND HARBOR, VENICE, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 389, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Playa del Rey is on Santa Monica Bay on the coast of California, 20 miles northwest of Los Angeles Harbor.

Report authorized by: Senate Committee Resolution, June 2, 1936, and River and Harbor Act, August 26, 1937.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Two entrance jetties each about 2,300 feet long; entrance channel 20 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and 1,925 feet long; interior channel 20 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and 5,600 feet long; a central basin 10 feet deep; and 2 side basins 20 feet deep and 10 side basins 10 feet deep separated by mole-type piers; the dredged material to be used for piers and deposition on lowlands and beaches.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$6,151,000	\$19,427,000	\$25,578,000
Current.....	7,738,000	25,364,000	33,102,000

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements and rights-of-way; secure and hold in public interest lands bordering proposed development sufficient for functioning of harbor; relocate oil wells and utilities; construct bulkhead around basin "K"; extend north jetty at Ballona Creek; provide berthing and other facilities for small craft; provide parking areas and access roads, and landscaping; establish public body to regulate harbor facilities; dredge or bear the actual cost of dredging the 12 side basins; maintain and operate entire project except aids to navigation, entrance jetties, and project depths in the entrance channel, interior channel, and central basin; and hold and save United States from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Federal:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$251,555	\$284,610
Maintenance.....	26,000	33,000
Subtotal.....	277,555	317,610
Non-Federal.....	655,470	653,480
Total.....	933,025	971,090
Annual benefits:		
Increased land value.....	215,000	270,000
Mosquito control savings.....	16,000	20,000
Recreation.....	900,000	1,120,000
Auto travel savings.....	35,000	38,000
Boat maintenance savings.....	8,000	12,000
Prevention of boat damage.....	75,000	94,000
Increased fish catch.....	47,000	47,000
Total.....	1,296,000	1,601,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.4	1.6

Remarks: Federal participation should amount to \$3,869,000 (May 1954 prices) or 50 percent of that recommended in the report. Half of the cost of constructing entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and central basin is to be borne by the Federal Government.

PORT HUENEME, CALIF

(H. Doc. 362, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Southeast end of Santa Barbara Channel on the coast of California about 65 miles northwest of Los Angeles Harbor.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: (1) Small boat harbor, protected by 2 jetties; (2) beach restoration by means of depositing dredged material from small boat harbor on downcoast shoreline, construction of offshore breakwater to form sand trap, and periodic dredging of sand trap to nourish downcoast shoreline.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$4,061,000	\$1,602,000	\$5,663,000
Current.....	5,437,000	1,858,000	7,295,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way; relocate utilities; maintain and operate harbor facilities, except those constructed by United States; prohibit pollution of beaches; hold and save United States free from damages; make sites available for fish canneries; agree that biennial dredging and bypassing of beach material be a Federal expense only so long as Federal ownership or use of the lands and improvements necessitates such protection.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$393,400	\$503,600
Annual benefits.....	587,100	719,100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.4

Remarks: In view of the protection of military installation provided by certain features of the project, the use of an equitable share of military funds for construction and maintenance should be explored when project is initiated.

ROGUE RIVER, HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH, OREG.

(S. Doc. 83, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rogue River is located in the southwest corner of Oregon, draining 5,080 square miles. The river generally flows westward into the Pacific Ocean 264 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River and 319 miles north of San Francisco.

Report authorized by: Senate Commerce Committee resolution, July 31, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for 2 jetties at entrance of Rogue River, a channel 13 feet deep and 300 feet wide from the ocean to a point immediately below the State highway bridge, and widening channel at a point 0.25 mile below highway bridge to form turning basin 13 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 650 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,758,700	\$163,800	\$3,922,500
Current.....	3,758,700	163,800	3,922,500

Local cooperation: Furnish free of cost to United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; provide adequate public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms; dredge and maintain project depths within 50 feet of the terminal facilities; and hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$312,100	\$297,400
Annual benefits.....	366,100	396,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.17	1.33

Remarks: In addition to the direct benefits that would accrue if the improvement is constructed, business would be stimulated, property values increased, and utilization of the nation's timber resources would be increased. Trucking is at present the only form of transportation in the area.

UMPQUA HARBOR AND RIVER, SCHOLFIELD RIVER AT REEDSPORT, OREG.

(S. Doc. 133, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Umpqua River, Oreg., empties into the Pacific Ocean 178 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River. Scholfield River rises south of the Umpqua River and flows northwestward about 13 miles to its confluence with Umpqua River at Reedsport, Oreg.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, March 4, 1947.

Existing project: No existing project on Scholfield River. Project for Umpqua River provides for a jetty-protected entrance channel 26 feet deep and a river channel 22 feet deep, 200 feet wide, and about 11 miles long to Reedsport; together with turning and mooring basins and various widths and depths to Gardiner, Oreg.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel in Scholfield River 12 feet deep, generally 100 feet wide, from its confluence with the Umpqua River to a point 0.5 mile below the first railroad bridge, a distance of 2 miles, the entrance to be widened to 300 feet in a distance of 500 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$41,000	\$10,000	\$51,000
Current.....	41,000	10,000	51,000

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash \$10,000 toward the cost of the new work; agree to furnish, free of cost to United States, suitable spoil areas; hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$2,040	\$1,800
Maintenance.....	7,000	7,000
Total.....	9,040	8,800
Annual benefits:		
Savings on movement of logs.....	7,000	9,625
Savings on handling of lumber.....	8,000	8,000
Total.....	15,000	17,625
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.66	2.0

Remarks: Local interests have offered to provide additional terminal facilities on the Scholfield River as needed, and to contribute \$10,000 toward the first cost of the improvement if the dredged material is deposited in a specified area. The Chief of Engineers recommends acceptance of this cash contribution.

COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OREGON AND WASHINGTON

(H. Doc. 249, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Columbia River at its mouth, the reach under consideration, forms the boundary of Washington and Oregon. It enters the Pacific Ocean between low sandspits.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, August 4, 1948; and House Public Works Committee resolutions, August 6, 1948, and June 7, 1954.

Existing project: Provides for a channel at mouth 40 feet deep, of suitable width, not less than one-half mile, to be secured by dredging and jetties, supplemented by groins if necessary.

Recommended plan of improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for a channel of suitable alinement with depth of 48 feet for a width of one-half mile to be secured by dredging and construction of a spur jetty on the north shore.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$8, 555, 000	-----	\$8, 555, 000
Current.....	8, 555, 000	-----	8, 555, 000

Local cooperation: None required.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$302, 000	\$302, 000
Maintenance.....	195, 000	195, 000
Total.....	497, 000	497, 000
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of delays.....	105, 975	105, 975
Elimination of cargo shut out.....	178, 200	178, 200
Elimination of ship groundings.....	290, 025	290, 025
Total.....	574, 200	574, 200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.16	1.16

Remarks: The benefits to shipping and industry would be widespread owing to the nature and extent of commodities moving over the subject waterway.

COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK, WASH., AND THE HEAD OF SAND ISLAND

(S. Doc. 8, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Chinook, Wash., is on the northerly shore of the Columbia River estuary at the east end of Baker Bay. Sand Island, 3 miles long, separates Baker Bay from the main channel of the estuary.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, June 1, 1948.

Existing project: Between Chinook and head of Sand Island provides for a channel 150 feet wide, 8 feet deep, and 4,000 feet long and

reinforcement and maintenance of breakwater constructed by local interests.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel 10 feet deep and 150 feet wide extending from the head of Sand Island to Chinook; a turning and mooring basin at upper end of the channel 10 feet deep, 660 feet long, and ranging from 275 to 500 feet wide; reconstruction of 393 feet of existing breakwater; and extension of existing breakwater to connect with shore in vicinity of Portland Street.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$196, 200	\$12, 000	\$208, 200
Current.....	227, 100	12, 000	239, 100

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save United States free from damages; maintain project depth of 10 feet in turning and mooring basin; dredge and maintain project depth in berthing areas within 50 feet of existing wharf, and provide and maintain terminal facilities.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$20, 500	\$26, 420
Annual benefits:		
Eliminate damage and delays.....	27, 150	26, 340
Increased fish catch.....	8, 625	8, 360
Recreation.....	1, 340	1, 300
Total.....	37, 115	36, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.81	1.36

WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR AND NASELLE RIVER, WASH.

(H. Doc. 425, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Willapa Bay is in southwestern Washington about 28 miles north of mouth of Columbia River. Willapa River enters the bay from the east and Naselle River enters from the south.

Report authorized by: Committee resolutions: Senate, Commerce, June 15, 1944; House, Rivers and Harbors, October 2, 1944; House Public Works, August 16, 1950; and House Public Works, February 20, 1951.

Existing project: Channel at mouth of Willapa Bay, 26 feet deep, with a minimum width of 500 feet; channel 24 feet deep and 200 wide from deep water in the bay up Willapa River to Raymond including a cutoff channel 3,100 feet long at Narrows; and various channels 24 feet and 10 feet deep. Total length of channels is 26 miles for main channels and about 2,800 feet for Palix River channel.

Plan of recommended improvement: *Tokeland:* Mooring basin 15 feet deep, 350 feet wide and 600 feet long adjacent to port wharf. *Nahcotta:* entrance channel 10 feet deep and 300 feet wide; mooring basin 10 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 1,100 feet long; and a rubble-mound breakwater 1,600 feet long. *Willapa River:* Widening channel to

300 feet and 250 feet from South Bend to Raymond. *Naselle River:* Removal of snags and obstructions from Naselle to the mouth.

Estimated cost:

	Project document		Current	
	Federal	Non-Federal	Federal	Non-Federal
Tokeland.....	\$76,500	\$38,700	\$91,000	\$46,350
Nahcotta.....	474,100	27,000	567,300	31,550
Willapa River.....	265,500		316,800	
Naselle River.....	1,610		1,900	
Total.....	817,710	65,700	977,000	77,900

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages; construct and maintain mooring, landing, and service facilities; construct and maintain bulkheads at Tokeland; maintain moorage areas to project depth; and maintain access roads.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Tokeland.....	\$6,960	\$7,530
Nahcotta.....	30,730	34,300
Willapa River.....	16,870	18,840
Naselle River.....	315	352
Annual benefits:		
Tokeland.....	13,400	16,120
Nahcotta.....	36,150	42,300
Willapa River.....	19,010	21,820
Naselle River.....	910	1,040
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Tokeland.....	1.92	2.14
Nahcotta.....	1.18	1.23
Willapa River.....	1.13	1.16
Naselle River.....	2.89	2.95

GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WASH.

(H. Doc. 412, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Grays Harbor is on coast of Washington 45 miles north of the mouth of Columbia River. Chehalis enters Grays Harbor from the east at a point 13 miles from the ocean.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 27, 1947.

Existing project: Entrance channel 600 feet wide and 30 feet deep with jetties 16,000 feet and 13,734 feet, respectively; maintenance of a channel 30 feet deep and 350 feet wide from deep water in Grays Harbor to port commission terminal, a distance of 13.25 miles, and a channel to Montesano, a distance of 16 miles, varying in depth from 26 feet to 16 feet and varying in width from 150 to 350 feet, with a turning basin at Montesano.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel 30 feet deep and 350 feet wide from upstream end of the authorized 30-foot channel to Cow Point, a distance of 4,000 feet; thence 30 feet deep and 200 feet wide to a point 13,700 feet upstream from the Union Pacific Railroad bridge at Aberdeen, a distance of about 21,800 feet; and a turning

basin 550 feet wide, 1,000 feet long, and 30 feet deep near the upstream end of the channel; and Federal maintenance dredging of the 30-foot channel above the railroad bridge and the turning basin near Cosmopolis.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$403, 400	\$67, 700	\$471, 100
Current.....	421, 800	69, 600	491, 400

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages; lend the United States the port of Grays Harbor pipeline dredge; provide and maintain at proposed project depth access channels to active loading wharves, and areas along the channel, and the berthing areas within 50 feet of the wharves; and continue removal of snags from the entire main channel.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Federal:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$14, 224	\$14, 673
Maintenance.....	12, 500	13, 000
Non-Federal.....	3, 741	3, 854
Total.....	30, 465	31, 727
Annual benefits:		
Savings in ships' time.....	16, 380	17, 000
Savings in transshipment.....	4, 500	4, 680
Savings in rail haul.....	5, 370	5, 580
Savings in damage.....	7, 000	7, 300
Total.....	33, 250	34, 560
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 1	1. 09

GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WASH.

(Westhaven breakwater extension)

Location: Grays Harbor is on coast of Washington 45 miles north of the mouth of Columbia River. Westhaven is at entrance to Grays Harbor.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution July 29, 1953.

Existing project: Insofar as Westhaven Cove is concerned, the project for Grays Harbor and Chehalis River provides for a breakwater 1,000 feet long, maintenance of the shallow-draft entrance channel to the cove, and a 7,500 feet revetment for protection of Point Chehalis. Completed except Point Chehalis revetment.

Plan of recommended improvement: Additional breakwater 1,400 feet long southeasterly of existing breakwater.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Current.....	\$323, 700	\$250, 000	\$573, 700

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and suitable disposal areas; hold and save the United States free of damages; dredge and maintain new basin; construct and maintain any additional bulkheads in the new basin area; construct, maintain, and operate adequate mooring facilities, utilities and a public landing.

Project economics:

Annual charges:

Federal:	Current
Interest and amortization-----	\$11, 530
Maintenance, breakwater-----	11, 500
Maintenance, navigation aids-----	300
Subtotal-----	23, 330
Non-Federal-----	5, 995
Total-----	29, 325

Annual benefits:

Prevention of damage to boats-----	12, 500
Increase in commercial fish catch-----	13, 650
Recreational craft-----	6, 820
Miscellaneous-----	4, 000
Total-----	36, 970
Benefit-cost ratio-----	1. 26

ANACORTES HARBOR, WASH.

(S. Doc. 102, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Anacortes Harbor is along the northerly shores of Fidalgo Island at the easterly end of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Wash.

Report authorized by: Senate Committee on Public Works resolution, June 17, 1947.

Existing project: Provides for improvement of Capsante Waterway, to secure a channel 12 feet deep and 250 to 150 feet wide extending eastward from the east side of Q Avenue to deep water, a distance of about 2,850 feet. Project was substantially completed in 1930.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a mooring basin 12 feet deep, 570 feet wide, and 960 feet long, adjacent to the north side of Capsante Waterway, protected by a pile breakwater 380 feet long about 50 feet east of the mooring basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document-----	\$172, 400	\$89, 000	\$261, 400
Current-----	179, 300	92, 000	271, 300

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; provide mooring and landing facilities; maintain to project dimensions those portions of the basin where mooring facilities are provided; and contribute in cash or equivalent work 14.5 percent of the cost of dredging the mooring basin and constructing the breakwater, presently estimated at \$26,000.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$13,250	\$13,700
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of damages.....	11,260	11,900
Value of increased catch.....	2,540	2,980
Increased benefits pleasure craft.....	2,520	2,650
Increased land rental.....	690	730
Total.....	17,010	18,260
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.28	1.33

NEAH BAY, WASH.

(H. Doc. 404, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Neah Bay lies on the south side of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, about 8 miles east of Cape Flattery, at the northwest tip of Washington.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Rivers and Harbors resolution, June 7, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for breakwater 8,000 feet long between Waada Island and the westerly shore of the bay.

Plan of recommended improvement: Reinforcement of existing rock revetment extending 1,800 feet west from Baada Point and 200 feet extension of the revetment westward, then successive 200 feet extensions at intervals of 2 years, or as needed, for a total of 1,200 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$118,650	-----	\$118,650
Current.....	139,250	-----	139,250

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and hold and save the United States from damages.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$4,120	\$4,470
Maintenance.....	2,000	2,300
Total.....	6,120	6,770
Annual benefits: Prevention of damage and protection of property.....	12,390	14,175
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.0	2.1

BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WASH.

(H. Doc. 558, 82d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Bellingham Harbor is in northwestern part of Washington, about 90 miles north of Seattle.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, August 30, 1944.

Existing project: Completed in 1931; provides for depths of 26 feet in the outer 3,800 feet of Whatcom Creek Waterway and of 18 feet in the inner 1,300 feet; dredging an entrance channel 200 feet wide and 26 feet deep from deep water to the west end of Squalicum Creek Basin; maintenance of southerly half and westerly end of Squalicum Creek Basin to a depth of 26 feet; and maintenance of breakwater constructed by local interests in 1934.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a small-boat basin adjacent to Squalicum Creek Waterway, consisting of two sections of rubble-mound breakwater with combined length of about 3,900 feet; removal of the existing rubble-mound breakwater now included for maintenance in the existing project, and use of the rock therefrom in construction of the new breakwater, and maintenance of minimum depth of 12 feet in the entrance to the basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,224,300	\$454,080	\$1,678,380
Current.....	1,366,650	502,500	1,869,150

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; remove timber-pile portions of existing breakwater and perform dredging to maintain basin to depth of 12 feet; construct dolphins at ends of breakwater; and provide and operate moorage facilities, etc.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$78,380	\$82,505
Annual benefits:		
Fishing craft.....	83,600	94,010
Pleasure craft.....	44,880	48,180
Total.....	128,480	142,190
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.64	1.72

Remarks: Improvement would result in benefits to fishing industry and recreational boating.

BLAINE HARBOR, WASH.

(H. Doc. 240, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Blaine Harbor is in the northwestern part of Washington immediately south of the international boundary and about 100 miles north of Seattle.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, June 23, 1943.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of rubble-mound breakwater about 1,500 feet long; dredging 14.7 acres to 12 feet as shoreward extension of existing mooring basin, with an entrance channel of same depth and 100 feet to 150 feet wide; and maintenance of about 850 feet of existing breakwater.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$354,800	\$197,350	\$552,150
Current.....	436,000	244,800	680,800

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; accomplish and maintain alterations as required; maintain present mooring basin; maintain portions of existing breakwater not included in the Federal project, and maintain the basin extension; and construct, maintain, and operate adequate mooring facilities, utilities, and public landing with service and supply facilities open to all on equal terms.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$31,910	\$35,040
Annual benefits:		
Fishing fleet.....	18,263	22,790
Increase in fish catch.....	14,260	20,650
Recreational boats.....	7,310	8,800
Savings in maintenance of present harbor.....	5,000	6,100
Total.....	44,833	58,340
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.40	1.66

Remarks: Benefits would accrue largely to the fishing fleet in that damages and losses to boats would be eliminated and fish catch increased.

SHILSHOLE BAY, SEATTLE, WASH.

(H. Doc. 536, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Shilshole Bay is an indentation on the east shore of Puget Sound at Seattle, Wash.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, October 19, 1945.

Existing project: None for Shilshole Bay. Existing project for Lake Washington Ship Canal provides for a channel 34 feet deep and 300 feet wide from deep water in Shilshole Bay, a distance of 5,500 feet, together with various depths and widths to Lake Washington.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a breakwater 4,200 feet in length, north of the entrance to the Lake Washington Ship Canal and dredging the entrance and southerly part of the basin to a depth of 15 feet and 1,100 feet square, and the northerly part of the basin to a depth of 10 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,041,980	\$1,745,000	\$4,787,230
Current.....	3,397,300	2,030,900	5,428,200

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; alter utilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain project depths in areas occupied by boat slips; and provide mooring and landing facilities.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$196, 180	\$198, 510
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of damages and losses.....	69, 840	85, 370
Net value of increased catch.....	57, 490	80, 000
Recreational benefits.....	186, 070	212, 600
Delays to land traffic.....	27, 480	31, 500
Total.....	340, 880	409, 770
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.74	2.06

PORT ANGELES HARBOR, WASH.

(H. Doc. 155, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Port Angeles Harbor is located on Olympic Peninsula in northwestern part of State of Washington across the Strait of Juan de Fuca from Victoria, British Columbia.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, August 28, 1946.

Existing project: Provides for deepening to 30 feet the easterly 150 feet of the shoal between deepwater and the pier headline in the vicinity of the plant of Rayonier, Inc.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project to provide a mooring basin 15 feet deep at mean lower low water, 1,060 feet long, and 385 feet wide; a breakwater about 1,000 feet long along the outer side of the basin, and a breakwater about 100 feet long outside the entrance.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$411, 940	\$175, 000	\$586, 940
Current.....	477, 900	218, 950	696, 850

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; make alterations in sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities; provide bulkheads for dredged material; provide mooring and landing facilities; maintain mooring basin and breakwaters.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$24, 610	\$25, 620
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of damages.....	7, 000	8, 620
Net value of increased fish catch.....	25, 570	31, 100
Increased benefits to pleasure craft.....	6, 300	7, 260
Total.....	38, 870	46, 930
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.58	1.83

Remarks: Protection of Ediz Hook from wave action was found not economically feasible.

EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WASH.

(H. Doc. 569, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Everett Harbor is located on Port Gardner, at the mouth of Snohomish River in the northwestern part of the State of Washington.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Rivers and Harbors resolution, October 8, 1938.

Existing project: None for Snohomish River at Everett. The existing project for Everett Harbor provides for a training dike from Smith Island to a point opposite 23d Street with a gap at the natural outlet of Snohomish River and spur dikes at the gap; together with varying widths and depths.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for realining and enlarging to a depth of 15 feet and width of 150 feet to 425 feet that portion of the existing channel extending from deep water in Port Gardner to the settling basin opposite 14th Street; deepening the existing settling basin to 20 feet; construction of a spur dike extending westward from Preston Point a distance of 1,410 feet; and removing the existing training dike north of the gap.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$325, 970	\$5, 000	\$330, 970
Current.....	395, 500	6, 500	402, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way and spoil disposal areas; hold and save United States from damage; maintain depths in access channels.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$13, 290	\$14, 230
Maintenance.....	10, 000	13, 000
Total.....	23, 290	27, 230
Annual benefits:		
Savings in maintenance and repair costs.....	15, 200	20, 200
Increased fish catch.....	20, 000	20, 000
Total.....	35, 200	40, 200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 51	1. 48

Remarks: The improved channel would encourage use of the small boat harbor and terminal facilities. Indirect benefits would accrue to the community through the increased fish supply and the ready access to the new industrial sites.

QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WASH.

(H. Doc. 579, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Quillayute River enters the Pacific Ocean at Quillayute Bay about 31 miles south of the entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, August 30, 1944.

Existing project: Provides for a closing dike with groins on westerly side of the river at the mouth, a jetty on the easterly side of the river, and maintenance dredging to afford a channel 6 feet deep from the ocean to within the river mouth.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending about 2,000 feet upstream from deep water; a basin 10 feet deep, 300 to 425 feet wide, and 2,400 feet long at the upper end of the channel, and raising the jetty on the east side of the entrance channel to a height of 15 feet above mean lower low water.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$375,000	\$20,100	\$395,100
Current.....	425,540	20,200	442,740

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; alter sewer, water supply, drainage, and other utility facilities; provide mooring and landing facilities, and contribute in cash \$20,000.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$84,200	\$92,625
Annual benefits:		
Elimination of damages.....	11,900	13,800
Savings in maintenance and transportation costs.....	80,500	81,850
Increased fish catch.....	9,280	9,740
Total.....	101,680	105,390
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.21	1.14

COPPER RIVER AND GULF COAST, ALASKA (SEWARD AND VALDEZ HARBORS)

(H. Doc. 182, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Copper River rises in the Wrangell Range in Alaska and flows generally southward into the Gulf of Alaska.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948; River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945; and resolution of Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 28, 1941.

Existing project: Seward Harbor provides for a south breakwater 580 feet long and a north breakwater 950 feet long, and dredging a basin about 207,000 square feet in area between the breakwaters to a

depth of 12½ feet. Valdez Harbor provides for dredging a small-boat and seaplane basin of about 3 acres in area to a depth of 12 feet.

Recommended plan of improvement: Seward Harbor, modification of existing project to provide for construction of a 3-foot concrete wall on top of the south breakwater and construction of a single-row treated-pile, east breakwater to reduce harbor entrance width to 75 feet. Valdez Harbor, modification of existing project to provide for construction of a rock gravel breakwater along the southeast side of the basin; and a two-section single-row timber-pile breakwater on the seaward side of the basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Seward Harbor.....	\$68,200	\$28,500	\$96,700
Valdez Harbor.....	97,000	16,000	113,000
Current:			
Seward Harbor.....	81,200	33,900	115,100
Valdez Harbor.....	116,600	19,000	135,600

Local cooperation: Hold and save the United States free from damages; provide and maintain mooring and landing facilities (applies to both Seward and Valdez).

Project economics:

	Project document		Current	
	Seward	Valdez	Seward	Valdez
Annual charges.....	\$5,900	\$6,300	\$6,430	\$7,040
Annual benefits:				
Elimination of damages and losses.....	7,700	9,000	9,800	11,100
Value of increased catch.....	16,600	6,925	21,200	8,600
Total.....	24,300	15,925	31,000	19,700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.1	2.5	4.82	2.80

HONOLULU HARBOR, T. H.

(H. Doc. 717, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Honolulu Harbor is on the south side of the island of Oahu, T. H., about 2,100 miles southwest of San Francisco, Calif.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 22, 1947.

Existing project: Provides for an entrance channel 40 feet deep, 500 feet wide and 4,000 feet long; a main harbor basin 35 feet deep, about 1,520 feet wide, and 3,300 feet long; an inner harbor basin 35 feet deep, about 1,000 feet wide, and about 3,400 feet long; a connecting channel 35 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and 3,400 feet long; and one slip 35 feet deep, 250 feet wide and 1,000 feet long.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a second entrance channel 35 feet deep extending seaward from the west end of Kapalama Basin, having a width of 400 feet for 5,850 feet, thence increasing to a width of 1,000 feet in a distance of 4,150 feet; and installation of a pontoon drawbridge or other suitable movable type.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$2,380,000	-----	\$2,380,000
Current.....	3,022,000	-----	3,022,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damage; relinquish to the United States without royalty charge, all salvable material removed from the channel; and the Territory of Hawaii take title to the proposed drawbridge, maintain, and operate it.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$147,500	\$159,100
Annual benefits:		
Savings in time lost.....	69,660	97,400
Reduced cost of operation.....	60,950	85,300
Savings in transit time.....	32,420	45,300
Total.....	163,030	228,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.11	1.4

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Hampton Beach, N. H.....	H. 325, 83d Cong.....	\$140,000
Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.....	H. 134, 82d Cong.....	189,000
Revere Beach, Mass.....	H. 146, 82d Cong.....	402,900
Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.....	H. 145, 82d Cong.....	409,000
South Shore, State of Rhode Island.....	H. 490, 81st Cong.....	166,550
Hammonasset River to East River (area 2), Conn.....	H. 474, 81st Cong.....	-----
Hammonasset Beach.....		166,600
Middle Beach.....		20,400
New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (area 3), Conn.....	H. 203, 83d Cong.....	-----
Prospect Beach.....		84,600
Woodmont Shore.....		42,400
Gulf Beach.....		13,100
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.....		18,300
Housatonic River to Ash Creek (area 7), Conn.....	H. 248, 83d Cong.....	-----
Short Beach.....		26,500
Seaside Park.....		119,000
Atlantic City, N. J.....	H. 538, 81st Cong.....	2,044,000
Ocean City, N. J.....	H. 184, 83d Cong.....	105,000
Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.....	H. 206, 83d Cong.....	260,000
Virginia Beach, Va.....	H. 186, 83d Cong.....	525,514
Pinellas County, Fla.....	H. 380, 83d Cong.....	34,300
Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan.....	H. 28, 83d Cong.....	1,176,400
Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio.....	H. 229, 83d Cong.....	185,000
Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio.....	H. 502, 81st Cong.....	-----
Edgewater Park.....		1,275,000
White City Park.....		68,900
Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.....	H. 231, 83d Cong.....	2,006,000
Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.....	H. 343, 83d Cong.....	136,500
Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.....	H. 277, 83d Cong.....	3,874,000
Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.....	H. 349, 83d Cong.....	-----
Seal Beach.....		65,700
Surfside.....		91,600
Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.....	H. 29, 83d Cong.....	73,700
Waikiki Beach, T. H.....	H. 227, 83d Cong.....	283,700
Total.....		14,003,664

¹ H. indicates House document.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

HAMPTON BEACH, N. H.

(H. Doc. 325, 83d Cong. 2d sess.)

Location: On the Atlantic Ocean, in the town of Hampton, 2 to 3 miles north of the Massachusetts-New Hampshire boundary.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for beach-erosion control.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for direct placement of about 340,000 cubic yards of sand fill on about 5,200 feet of shore to widen the beach to a general width of 150 feet, with an added 25-foot widening along the northern 1,250 feet of the fill area.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$140,000	\$280,000	\$420,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first cost of its construction; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	<i>Project document</i>
Interest and amortization.....	\$14,810
Maintenance (local).....	22,700
Total.....	37,510
Annual benefits:	
Protective.....	5,830
Increased earning power.....	36,060
Recreational.....	22,030
Total.....	63,920
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.7

LYNN-NAHANT BEACH, MASSACHUSETTS

(H. Doc. 134, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Atlantic Ocean about 9 miles northeast of Boston. Includes about 2¾ miles of shore in the city of Lynn and towns of Swampscott and Nahant.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Corps of Engineers' beach erosion project for the area.

Recommended plan of improvement: Placement of sand to provide a backshore elevation of 18 feet for 2,600 feet south of Woodbury's Point, thence construction of a stone mound southward for 6,250 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$154,670	\$309,330	\$464,000
Current.....	189,000	379,000	568,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation is subject to the conditions that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will (1) adopt the aforementioned plan of protection and improvement and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire work prior to the commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work; and provided further that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will give satisfactory assurances that it will (a) maintain the protective and improvement works during the useful life thereof as may be required to serve their intended purpose, (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise either before, during or after prosecution of the work, (c) assure that water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers will not be permitted, and (d) assure continued public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$21,180	\$22,620
Maintenance (local).....	6,840	8,750
Total.....	28,020	31,370
Annual benefits:		
Direct damages prevented.....	14,050	-----
Recreational.....	27,720	-----
Total.....	41,770	53,420
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.7

REVERE BEACH, MASS.

(H. Doc. 146, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Atlantic Ocean about 5½ miles northeast of Boston. Study includes 3 miles of shore in city of Revere.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provision of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: No improvement of Revere Beach has been authorized by Congress.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for placement of 522,000 cubic yards of sand fill on 13,700 feet of shore south from Northern Circle, to provide a general backshore elevation of 18 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$337, 300	\$674, 700	\$1, 012, 000
Current.....	402, 900	805, 850	1, 208, 750

Local cooperation: The improvement is recommended for Federal participation provided that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will (1) adopt the aforementioned plan of protection and improvement and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire work prior to the commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work; and provided further that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will give satisfactory assurances that it will (a) maintain the protective and improvement measures during the useful life thereof as may be required to serve their intended purpose, (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise either before, during, or after prosecution of the work, (c) assure that water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction that would endanger the health of bathers will not be permitted; and, (d) assure continued public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$46, 180	\$48, 160
Maintenance (local).....	10, 630	11, 560
Total.....	56, 810	59, 720
Annual benefits:		
Direct damages prevented.....	16, 745	19, 510
Increased valuation of land.....	13, 830	17, 690
Recreational.....	210, 840	278, 260
Total.....	241, 415	315, 460
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.2	5.3

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Revere Beach since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

QUINCY SHORE BEACH, MASS.

(H. Doc. 145, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Quincy Bay in Boston Harbor, 6 miles southeast of Boston. Includes southerly 6,700 feet of Quincy Shore reservation under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan District Commission.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provision of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: No improvement of Quincy Shore Beach has been authorized by Congress.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for: (a) placing approximately 379,000 cubic yards of material on 8,500 feet of beach to provide a backshore elevation of 15 feet above mean low water, (b) constructing 4,750 feet of concrete and steel bulkhead with top elevation of 18 feet, (c) constructing 325 feet of concrete seawall with top elevation 19.2 feet, and (d) constructing a culvert at Sachem Creek and extending existing drains.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$299,000	\$598,000	\$897,000
Current.....	409,000	818,000	1,227,000

Local cooperation: The improvement is recommended for Federal participation provided that local interests adopt the plan of protection and improvement recommended and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction, submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire work prior to the commencement of such work, provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work, and provided further that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will give satisfactory assurances that it will (a) maintain the protective and improvement measures during the useful life thereof as may be required to serve their intended purpose; (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise either before, during, or after prosecution of the work; (c) not permit water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers; and (d) maintain continued public ownership of the beach and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$38,800	\$48,890
Maintenance (local).....	6,950	8,950
Total.....	45,750	57,840
Annual benefits:		
Damages prevented.....	20,850	26,675
Increased property values.....	15,330	19,605
Recreational.....	56,850	73,520
Total.....	93,030	119,800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.0	2.9

SOUTH SHORE, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

(H. Doc. 490, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On Atlantic Ocean and Block Island Sound. Study included about 31 miles of shore in the towns of Narragansett, South Kingstown, Charlestown, and Westerly.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing beach erosion control project for the area.

Recommended plan of improvement: (a) At Narragansett Pier, widening the beach an average of about 125 feet by direct placement of sand, construction of 7 groins and a barrier to landward sand movement; (b) at Point Judith Harbor, widening about 1 mile of beach an average of about 65 feet by direct placement of sand, constructing a barrier to landward sand movement and 10 groins if experience indicates their necessity; (c) at Napatree Beach, constructing a barrier to landward sand movement and three groins if experience indicates their necessity.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
<i>Project document:</i>			
Narragansett Pier.....	\$45,500	\$173,500	\$219,000
Point Judith Harbor.....	63,500	176,500	240,000
Napatree Beach.....	25,000	50,000	75,000
Total.....	134,000	400,000	534,000
<i>Current:</i>			
Narragansett Pier.....	61,530	228,970	290,500
Point Judith Harbor.....	74,000	212,400	286,400
Napatree Beach.....	31,000	62,000	93,000
Total.....	166,530	503,370	669,900

Local cooperation: The improvement is recommended for Federal participation provided that local interests adopt the plan of protection and improvement recommended and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction for publicly owned portions and all the cost for privately owned portions of the shore, submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecution of new work of protection and improvement for each locality prior to commencement thereof; provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from any damage claims that may arise from the prosecution of the work, prevent water pollution that would endanger health of bathers, and maintain a continued public ownership of the beach and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Narragansett:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$9, 160	\$10, 240
Maintenance (local).....	1, 240	1, 240
Total.....	10, 400	11, 480
Point Judith Harbor:		
Interest and amortization.....	9, 995	10, 100
Maintenance (local).....	4, 250	4, 250
Total.....	14, 245	14, 350
Napatree Beach:		
Interest and amortization.....	3, 100	3, 280
Maintenance (local).....	4, 600	4, 600
Total.....	7, 700	7, 880
Annual benefits:		
Narragansett:		
Damage prevented.....	3, 650	3, 650
Increased land area.....	8, 875	11, 290
Recreational.....	15, 500	24, 500
Total.....	28, 025	39, 440
Point Judith Harbor:		
Damage prevented.....	14, 150	20, 470
Increased land area.....	760	1, 000
Recreational.....	7, 500	12, 000
Total.....	22, 410	33, 470
Napatree Beach:		
Damage prevented.....	5, 300	5, 300
Recreational.....	3, 060	3, 215
Total.....	8, 360	8, 515
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Narragansett.....	2. 7	3. 4
Point Judith Harbor.....	1. 6	2. 3
Napatree Beach.....	1. 1	1. 1

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

HAMMONASSET RIVER TO EAST RIVER, CONN. (AREA 2)

(H. Doc. 474, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On Long Island Sound 25 miles east of New Haven, Conn. Study included 10 miles of shore in the town of Madison and adjoining towns of Clinton and Guilford.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Corps of Engineers' project for beach-erosion control.

Recommended plan of improvement: (a) Hammonasset Beach—provides for widening about 10,000 feet of beach by 50 feet to 100 feet by direct placement of sand, construction of two training walls at Toms Creek and a groin at Hammonasset Point; (b) Middle Beach—provides for revetment of 700 feet of seawall by placement of riprap, or, contingent upon evidence satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers that facilities for public use will be provided by local interests, widen-

ing to a 100-foot width 700 feet of beach by the direct placement of sand and construction of a groin, all in lieu of the revetment.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Hammonasset Beach.....	\$123,000	\$256,000	\$384,000
Middle Beach:			
Recommended plan.....	11,000	22,000	33,000
Alternate plan.....	17,000	34,000	51,000
Total:			
Recommended plan.....	139,000	278,000	417,000
Alternate plan.....	145,000	290,000	435,000
Current:			
Hammonasset Beach.....	166,600	333,200	499,800
Middle Beach:			
Recommended plan.....	11,800	23,800	35,600
Alternate plan.....	20,400	41,000	61,400
Total:			
Recommended plan.....	178,400	357,000	535,400
Alternate plan.....	187,000	374,200	561,200

Local cooperation: The improvements are recommended for Federal participation provided (a) local authorities adopt the plans of protection and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for each project; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and provided further that local interests give assurances that they will maintain the works during the useful life thereof, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, assure that water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction will not be permitted, and assure continued public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Hammonasset Beach (interest and amortization).....	\$15,840	\$17,630
Maintenance (local).....	5,500	5,500
Total.....	21,340	23,130
Middle Beach:		
Recommended plan:		
Interest and amortization.....	1,370	1,260
Maintenance (local).....	200	260
Total.....	1,570	1,520
Alternate plan:		
Interest and amortization.....	2,120	2,165
Maintenance (local).....	3,400	3,400
Total.....	5,520	5,565
Annual benefits:		
Hammonasset Beach (recreational).....	157,500	157,500
Middle Beach:		
Recommended plan: Protective.....	4,200	2,340
Alternate plan:		
Protective.....	4,200	2,340
Recreational.....	10,700	13,700
Total.....	14,900	16,040
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Hammonasset Beach.....	7.4	6.9
Middle Beach:		
Recommended plan.....	2.7	1.5
Alternate plan.....	2.7	2.9

Remarks: Certain urgent work accomplished by local interests since formulation of the recommended project should be considered as part of the project.

NEW HAVEN HARBOR TO HOUSATONIC RIVER, CONN. (AREA 3)

(H. Doc. 203, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Long Island Sound immediately west of New Haven. Study included 16 miles of shore in the towns of West Haven and Milford.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: At New Haven Harbor, a dike, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of August 2, 1882 was constructed to contract and direct tidal flow in order to maintain the dredged channel over Fort Hale Bar. At Milford Harbor groins and jetties were constructed under authority of the River and Harbor Act of June 23, 1874 to reduce shore erosion and deposition in navigation channels. Under authority of the River and Harbor Act of August 11, 1888, a stone breakwater was constructed at the mouth of Housatonic River to prevent littoral drift from shoaling the navigation channel.

Recommended plan of improvement: (a) At Prospect Beach, West Haven, provides for widening to a 100-foot width by direct placement of sand, 6,000 feet of shore with an added 50-foot widening at the south end of the fill, and construction of 8 groins; (b) at Woodmont Shore, Milford, widening to a 100-foot width by direct placement of sand, 500 feet of shore in the first pocket beach west of Merwin Point, widening to a 100- to 150-foot width, 3,500 feet of shore northerly from Chapel Street, and construction of 5 groins; (c) at Gulf Beach, Milford, widening to a 100-foot width about 1,200 feet of beach by direct placement of sand; and (d) at Silver Beach to Cedar Beach, Milford, widening to a 100-foot width by direct placement of sand, 15,600 feet of shore along Silver, Myrtle, Walnut, Laurel, and Cedar Beaches and Meadows End, with an added widening of 150 feet around Meadows End, and construction of 11 groins.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Prospect Beach.....	\$64,000	\$149,600	\$213,600
Woodmont Shore.....	35,300	116,500	151,800
Gulf Beach.....	10,300	20,700	31,000
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.....	15,200	439,800	455,000
Total.....	124,800	726,600	851,400
Current:			
Prospect Beach.....	84,600	197,400	282,000
Woodmont Shore.....	42,400	139,500	181,900
Gulf Beach.....	13,100	26,200	39,300
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.....	18,300	530,700	549,000
Total.....	158,400	893,800	1,052,200

Local cooperation: The improvements are recommended for Federal participation provided that the State of Connecticut or responsible local authorities: (1) adopt the plans of protection and improvement

and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction for publicly owned portions and all the cost for privately owned portions of the shore; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting work on each project prior to the commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for accomplishment of the work; and provided further that responsible local authorities give satisfactory assurances that they will: (a) maintain the protective and improvement measures during the useful life thereof as may be required to serve their intended purpose; (b) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages that may arise before, during, or after prosecution of the work; (c) assure that water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers will not be permitted; and (d) maintain continued public ownership of the beach and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Prospect Beach (interest and amortization).....	\$8,870	\$9,960
Maintenance (local).....	6,720	7,560
Total.....	15,590	17,520
Woodmont Shore (interest and amortization).....	6,340	6,410
Maintenance (local).....	4,320	4,840
Total.....	10,660	11,250
Gulf Beach (interest and amortization).....	1,285	1,390
Maintenance (local).....	1,100	1,240
Total.....	2,385	2,630
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (interest and amortization).....	19,300	19,360
Maintenance (local).....	8,450	9,390
Total.....	27,750	28,750
Annual benefits:		
Prospect Beach:		
Protective.....	3,225	3,640
Increased earning power.....	690	780
Recreational.....	20,000	23,280
Total.....	23,915	27,700
Woodmont Shore:		
Protective.....	4,850	5,480
Increased earning power.....	2,070	2,340
Recreational.....	4,000	4,660
Total.....	10,920	12,480
Gulf Beach:		
Protective.....	730	820
Recreational.....	3,600	4,190
Total.....	4,330	5,010
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach:		
Protective.....	19,150	21,640
Increased earning power.....	14,430	16,300
Recreational.....	10,000	11,640
Total.....	43,580	49,580
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Prospect Beach.....	1.5	1.6
Woodmont Shore.....	1.0	1.1
Gulf Beach.....	1.8	1.9
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.....	1.6	1.7

Action by local interests: At Prospect Beach the Connecticut State Highway Department spent approximately \$50,000 in 1952 for revetment of a portion of the embankment behind the beach to protect the State highway. The town of West Haven spent about \$20,000 in 1953 for construction of a groin system along a short portion of Prospect Beach.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

HOUSATONIC RIVER TO ASH CREEK, CONN. (AREA 7)

(H. Doc. No. 248, 83d Cong., 2d sess.).

Location: On Long Island Sound, including the shores of the town of Stratford and the city of Bridgeport, a total length of about 12 miles study area is about 50 miles; east of New York City.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: Federal structures provided under a navigation project adopted in 1836 include riprap breakwaters at the entrance to and in Bridgeport Harbor, a seawall connecting the northerly and southerly parts of Fayerweather Island, a riprap breakwater connecting Fayerweather Island to the mainland, and riprap groins along the west shore of the Northern segment of Fayerweather Island.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) at Short Beach, Stratford, widening the beach to a general width of 125 feet by direct placement of about 116,000 cubic yards of sand fill over approximately 2,500 feet of shore; and (b) at Seaside Park, Bridgeport (west of Breezy Point), widening the beach to a general width of 125 feet by direct placement of about 635,000 cubic yards of sand fill over approximately 8,800 feet of shore.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Short Beach.....	\$24, 150	\$48, 350	\$72, 500
Seaside Park.....	105, 800	211, 700	317, 500
Total.....	129, 950	260, 050	390, 000
Current:			
Short Beach.....	26, 500	53, 000	79, 500
Seaside Park.....	119, 000	238, 000	357, 000
Total.....	145, 500	291, 000	436, 500

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the projects is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended plans and pay two-thirds of the first costs of their construction; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that they will maintain the projects during their useful lives, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction, and

continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Short Beach:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$2,990	\$2,800
Maintenance (local).....	5,700	5,920
Total.....	8,690	8,720
Seaside Park:		
Interest and amortization.....	13,130	12,590
Maintenance (local).....	6,360	6,610
Total.....	19,490	19,200
Annual benefits:		
Short Beach:		
Protective.....	1,900	1,970
Increased earning power.....	500	520
Recreational.....	17,340	18,010
Total.....	19,740	20,500
Seaside Park:		
Protective.....	8,082	9,100
Recreational.....	96,000	101,240
Total.....	104,082	110,340
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Short Beach.....	2.3	2.4
Seaside Park.....	5.3	5.7

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

(H. Doc. 538, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On Atlantic coast of New Jersey, about 45 miles northeast of Cape May which is at the southern tip of the State at the entrance to Delaware Bay. It includes nearly one-half the length of the barrier beach island known as Absecon Island.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: Navigation project adopted 1922, provides for an entrance channel in Absecon Inlet 20 feet deep and 400 feet wide.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) removal of damaged concrete wall at the city park and replacement by a steel-sheet piling wall; (b) a stone jetty extending from Brigantine Island, about 4,800 feet in length; (c) two new groins and stone extensions of existing groins along Maine Avenue; (d) revetment at toe of bulkhead along Maine Avenue; (e) artificial placement of sand fill to widen the ocean and inlet beaches, the amount not to exceed 1,200,000 cubic yards dredged from the east side of the channel; (f) extension of Oriental Avenue jetty; and (g) five new timber groins and extension of a stone groin on the ocean frontage.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1948).....	\$1,579,000	\$3,159,000	\$4,738,000
Current (fall 1953).....	2,044,000	4,088,000	6,132,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the city of Atlantic City will (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first cost of its construction; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that it will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$204, 075	-----
Maintenance (local).....	380, 000	-----
Total.....	584, 075	\$689, 400
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	3, 000	-----
Beach preservation.....	8, 439, 000	-----
Prevention of loss of income.....	550, 000	-----
Recreational.....	337, 000	-----
Total.....	9, 329, 000	12, 313, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	16. 0	17. 9

Action by local interests: (a) Placed 1,250 linear feet of stone revetment along inlet frontage in 1950; (b) constructed 5 timber groins on ocean frontage in 1951; (c) completed approximately 1,560 feet of Brigantine Island jetty in 1953; and (d) reconstructed seawall at north end of New Hampshire Avenue in 1953.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Atlantic City since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

OCEAN CITY, N. J.

(H. Doc. 184, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On the Atlantic coast of New Jersey about 35 miles northeast of Cape May at the entrance to Delaware Bay. Includes the barrier beach island 8 miles long between Great Egg and Corsons Inlets.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for shore protection in this area.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) artificial placement of approximately 1,900,000 cubic yards of sand fill to widen the beach to a width of approximately 300 feet from the boardwalk or bulkhead to the mean high-water line, from Surf Road to 12th Street, a distance of about 9,500 feet; and (b) extension of 7 existing stone groins as deferred construction when experience indicates the need therefor.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (October 1950).....	\$199,000	\$1,683,000	\$1,882,000
Current (fall 1953).....	105,000	887,000	992,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the city of Ocean City or other local authority will: (a) adopt the recommended plan, undertake the initial work within 5 years of the date of authorization by Congress, and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction applicable to publicly owned portions and all the first costs applicable to privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that it will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$79,490	\$35,000
Maintenance (local).....	62,100	62,000
Total.....	141,590	97,000
Annual benefits:		
Beach preservation.....	40,000	
Protective.....	30,000	
Increased land values.....	27,000	
Recreational.....	369,000	
Total.....	466,000	569,000

Action by local interests: Replenished beach between 14th Street and Atlantic Boulevard by placement of approximately 2,500,000 cubic yards of sand in 1952.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Ocean City since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

COLD SPRING INLET (CAPE MAY HARBOR) N. J.

(H. Doc. 206, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In Cape May County 6 miles east of Cape May Point which is the southwestern extremity of the New Jersey coastline at the entrance to Delaware Bay. Study area extends from Cold Spring Inlet to the western corporate limit on Delaware Bay of the borough of Cape May Point.

Report authorized by: The River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: There is no existing project for protection of the shore between Cold Spring Inlet and the borough of Cape May Point. The existing navigation project for Cold Spring Inlet provides for an entrance channel 25 feet deep and 2 parallel jetties extending to the 25-foot depth in the ocean.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for artificial placement of approximately 832,000 cubic yards of sand to widen the beach in Cape May City to 100- to 200-foot width above mean high water, artificial placement of 300,000 cubic yards of sand on the adjoining 3,000 feet of shore to the east, construction of 5 new groins and extension of 5 existing groins, the groin construction to be deferred pending demonstration of need.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$237,500	\$926,500	\$1,164,000
Current.....	260,000	1,010,000	1,270,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first cost of its construction applicable to the non-Federal publicly owned portions and all of the first costs applicable to the privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) assure maintenance of the protective and improvement measures during their useful life; (d) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; (e) hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages; (f) assure prevention of water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction; and (g) assure continued public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$48,750	\$44,800
Maintenance (local).....	84,250	91,000
Total.....	133,000	135,800
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	23,000	
Increased land value.....	6,300	
Recreational.....	204,000	
Total.....	233,300	265,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.8	2.0

Action by local interests: Constructed 2 stone groins in 1951, and extended 4 existing stone groins, 2 in 1952 and 2 in 1953.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.

(H. Doc. 186, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Atlantic coast of Virginia about 19 miles east of Norfolk and 3½ miles south of entrance to Chesapeake Bay. Includes the 3½ miles of ocean frontage of the city of Virginia Beach.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for beach erosion control at Virginia Beach.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) artificial placement of approximately 1,100,000 cubic yards of sand fill to widen the beach berm to a minimum width of approximately 100 feet at elevation 7 feet above mean low water; and (b) deferred construction of a system of approximately 21 groins when experience indicates the need therefor.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$675,000	\$1,349,000	\$2,024,500
Current.....	525,514	1,084,321	1,609,835

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the city of Virginia Beach will: (a) adopt the recommended plan, undertake the initial work within 5 years of the date of authorization by Congress; and pay two-thirds of the first costs of the construction applicable to the non-Federal publicly owned portions of the shore and all the costs applicable to the privately owned shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurance that it will maintain the project during its useful life; hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$92,480	\$56,761
Maintenance (local).....	14,000	28,250
Total.....	106,480	85,011
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	163,953	-----
Increased earning power.....	124,039	-----
Recreational.....	22,500	-----
Total.....	310,492	336,268
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.92	3.95

Action by local interests: Placed approximately 1,400,000 cubic yards of material on the beach in 1952-53 between Rudee Inlet and 45th Street, at a cost of about \$683,000.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Virginia Beach since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA.

Location: On the gulf coast of Florida, about midway of the peninsula. Study included about 25 miles of the 4 most developed barrier keys north of Tampa Bay; namely, Clearwater Beach Island, Sand Key, Treasure Island, and Long Key.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for improving the shores of Pinellas County, Fla.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for artificial placement of approximately 1,319,000 cubic yards of sand on the shore of Clearwater Beach Island, Sand Key, Treasure Island, and Long Key, to provide a beach 60 feet wide at mean high water, and construction of groins at the south ends of the islands.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (December 1952):			
Clearwater.....	\$9, 800	\$158, 900	\$168, 700
Sand Key.....	7, 500	268, 900	276, 400
Treasure Island.....	2, 000	116, 700	118, 700
Long Key.....	11, 900	77, 500	89, 400
Total.....	31, 200	622, 000	653, 200
Current (June 1953):			
Clearwater.....	10, 800	174, 500	185, 300
Sand Key.....	8, 200	295, 300	303, 500
Treasure Island.....	2, 200	128, 150	130, 350
Long Key.....	13, 100	85, 100	98, 200
Total.....	34, 300	683, 050	717, 350

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the projects is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt and satisfactorily complete the recommended plan within 10 years of the date of authorization and pay two-thirds of the first cost applicable to non-Federal publicly owned portions and all of the first cost applicable to privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that they will maintain the projects during their useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Clearwater Beach:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$5,950	\$6,535
Maintenance (local).....	8,060	8,850
Total.....	14,010	15,385
Sand Key:		
Interests and amortization.....	9,750	10,700
Maintenance (local).....	27,895	30,635
Total.....	37,645	41,335
Treasure Island:		
Interest and amortization.....	4,185	4,600
Maintenance (local).....	5,075	5,575
Total.....	9,260	10,175
Long Key:		
Interest and amortization.....	3,155	3,460
Maintenance (local).....	8,530	10,465
Total.....	11,685	13,925
Annual benefits:		
Clearwater Beach:		
Protective.....	27,400	
Increased property value.....	29,600	
Recreational.....	4,300	
Total.....	61,300	¹ 85,700
Sand Key:		
Protective.....	44,600	
Increased property value.....	63,100	
Recreational.....	3,000	
Total.....	110,700	¹ 154,400
Treasure Island:		
Protective.....	17,100	
Increased property value.....	20,800	
Recreational.....	1,300	
Total.....	39,200	¹ 54,800
Long Key:		
Protective.....	9,500	
Increased property value.....	18,100	
Recreational.....	6,100	
Total.....	33,700	¹ 46,700
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Clearwater.....	4.4	5.6
Sand Key.....	2.9	3.7
Treasure Island.....	4.2	5.4
Long Key.....	2.9	3.4

¹ Adjusted total.

ILLINOIS SHORE OF LAKE MICHIGAN

(H. Doc. 28, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: The southern 58 miles of the west shore of Lake Michigan, including the lake frontage of the city of Chicago.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for protecting the Illinois shoreline. Federal navigation projects at Waukegan,

Chicago, and Calumet Harbors provide for improved channels and breakwaters at these locations.

Recommended plans of improvement: (a) Lake Bluff, construction of 2 groins and placement of 10,000 cubic yards of sandfill at Lake Park; (b) Lake Forest, construction of 2 new groins and extension of 2 existing groins at Forest Park; (c) Winnetka, construction of 1 new groin, and extending and converting to an impermeable structure 1 existing groin at Elder Lane Park; (d) Kenilworth, construction of 1 new groin at Mahoney Park and 1 at Waterworks Park; (e) Evanston, placement of 45,000 cubic yards of sandfill and construction of a 600-foot jetty at Clark Street Beach, placement of 30,000 cubic yards of sandfill and construction of a 200-foot jetty at Dempster Street Beach, placement of 50,000 cubic yards of sandfill and construction of a 425-foot jetty at Lee Street Beach, and construction of 4,130 feet of riprap protection along the publicly owned shore; and (f) Chicago, placement of 1,225,000 cubic yards of sandfill, construction of 1,000 feet of pier, 6 groins, and 4,100 feet of submerged bulkhead between Grace Street and Belmont Harbor; placement of 4,194,000 cubic yards of sandfill, construction of 28 groins, 17,000 feet of submerged bulkhead, and 1,000 feet of pier between 27th and 49th Streets, and placement of 494,000 cubic yards of sandfill and construction of 2,000 feet of submerged bulkhead between 51st and 55th Streets.

Estimated costs	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document:			
Lake Bluff.....	\$11,300	\$22,700	\$34,000
Lake Forest.....	9,200	18,400	27,600
Winnetka.....	4,200	8,300	12,500
Kenilworth.....	6,400	12,600	19,000
Evanston.....	148,300	296,600	444,900
Chicago.....	693,000	13,255,000	13,948,000
Total.....	872,400	13,613,600	14,486,000
Current:			
Lake Bluff.....	14,100	28,100	42,200
Lake Forest.....	11,600	23,200	34,800
Winnetka.....	5,250	10,500	15,750
Kenilworth.....	8,000	15,800	23,800
Evanston.....	294,600	589,100	883,700
Chicago.....	846,900	18,722,300	19,569,200
Total.....	1,180,450	19,389,000	20,569,450

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the projects is recommended provided that local authorities (1) adopt the recommended plans and pay two-thirds of the first cost of their construction except for the projects in Chicago where they must pay two-thirds of the first costs of the construction of necessary additional protection of the existing shore plus all the first costs of the remaining work; (2) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the projects during their useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers, and continue public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Lake Bluff:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,412	\$1,490
Maintenance (local).....	108	140
Total.....	1,520	1,630
Lake Forest:		
Interest and amortization.....	1,142	1,230
Maintenance (local).....	69	170
Total.....	1,211	1,400
Winnetka:		
Interest and amortization.....	519	556
Maintenance (local).....	63	124
Total.....	582	680
Kenilworth:		
Interest and amortization.....	786	840
Maintenance (local).....	64	120
Total.....	850	960
Evanston:		
Interest and amortization.....	18,399	31,170
Maintenance (local).....	6,958	18,600
Total.....	25,357	49,770
Chicago:		
Interest and amortization.....	577,070	690,200
Maintenance (local).....	210,200	311,300
Total.....	787,270	1,001,500
Annual benefits:		
Lake Bluff: Protective.....	1,730	2,300
Lake Forest: Protective.....	1,360	1,920
Winnetka: Protective.....	780	1,000
Kenilworth:		
Protective.....	1,920	2,970
Recreational.....	890	1,520
Total (Kenilworth).....	2,810	4,490
Evanston:		
Protective.....	23,780	43,310
Recreational.....	58,400	99,280
Total (Evanston).....	82,180	142,590
Chicago:		
Protective.....	81,000	105,000
Recreational.....	772,000	1,312,100
Total (Chicago).....	853,000	1,417,100
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Lake Bluff.....	1.14	1.41
Lake Forest.....	1.12	1.37
Winnetka.....	1.34	1.47
Kenilworth.....	3.30	4.67
Evanston.....	3.24	2.86
Chicago.....	1.08	1.41

Action by local interests: Winnetka Park District constructed one new groin at Elder Lane Park, Winnetka, as recommended.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

VERMILION TO SHEFFIELD LAKE VILLAGE, OHIO (APPENDIX VIII)

(H. Doc. 229, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On the south shore of Lake Erie about 30 miles west of Cleveland, Ohio. Includes shore frontage of the city of Lorain.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for protecting the shore within the study area. Existing Federal navigation projects at Vermilion and Lorain provide for entrance piers and channels. The Lorain project also provides for an outer harbor protected by two breakwaters.

Recommended plan for improvement: Provides for artificial placement of approximately 100,000 cubic yards of sandfill, construction of 1 groin and adjoining seawall section, and reconstruction of 3 existing groins at Lakeview Park, Lorain, Ohio.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$146,000	\$292,000	\$438,000
Current.....	185,000	370,000	555,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended—provided that local authorities (1) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first costs of its construction; (2) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$18,100	\$19,500
Maintenance (local).....	1,800	2,300
Total.....	19,900	21,800
Annual benefits: Recreational.....	37,000	37,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.86	1.7

Action by local interests: Constructed one new groin and altered existing groins since the completion of the report.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

CLEVELAND AND LAKEWOOD, OHIO

(H. Doc. 502, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: On the south shore of Lake Erie 180 miles west of Buffalo, N. Y., at the east end of the lake. Area studied extends about 18 miles between the west city limit of Lakewood and the east city limit of Cleveland.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for improvement of the beaches at Cleveland. The original navigation project adopted in 1835 provided for two parallel jetties at the Cuyahoga River mouth. The existing navigation project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1875, and modified by subsequent acts provides for the present 5-mile outer harbor and breakwater system.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for: (a) at *Edgewater Park*, construction of 5 new groins, alteration of 4 existing groins, and placement of about 600,000 cubic yards of suitable fill; and (b) at *White City Park*, construction of a cutoff wall, and of 1 groin for stabilization of the existing beach, and redistribution of sand within the area.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1947):			
Edgewater Park.....	\$809,200	\$1,618,500	\$2,427,700
White City Park.....	42,700	85,400	128,100
Total.....	851,900	1,703,900	2,555,800
Current (July 1953):			
Edgewater Park.....	1,275,000	2,550,000	3,825,000
White City Park.....	68,900	137,800	206,700
Total.....	1,343,900	2,687,800	4,031,700

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (1) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first costs of its construction; (2) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, remedy water pollution that would endanger public health, and perpetuate public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Edgewater Park:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$100,500	\$135,000
Maintenance (local).....	14,400	26,000
Total.....	114,900	161,000
White City Park:		
Interest and amortization.....	5,400	7,200
Maintenance (local).....	500	700
Total.....	5,900	7,900
Grand total.....	120,800	168,900
Annual benefits:		
Edgewater Park:		
Protective.....	2,000	
Recreational.....	212,000	
Total.....	214,100	(1)
White City Park: Recreational.....	35,700	(1)
Grand total.....	249,800	249,800
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Edgewater Park.....	1.86	1.33
White City Park.....	6.05	4.52
Overall.....	2.10	1.50

¹ Unchanged.

PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, ERIE, PA.

(H. Doc. 231, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On south shore of Lake Erie at Erie, Pa., about 78 miles southwest of Buffalo, N. Y., and 102 miles northeast of Cleveland, Ohio. Study area includes lakeshore of a compound recurved sandspit over 6 miles in length.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no Federal beach erosion-control project for Presque Isle Peninsula.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for artificial placement of approximately 1,100,000 cubic yards of sand fill and construction of a seawall, bulkhead, and groin system along the neck of the peninsula, and for the remainder of the peninsula placement of approximately 1 million cubic yards of sand as a feeder beach at the waterworks reservation, distribution of approximately 400,000 cubic yards additional sand on the beach between the waterworks and lighthouse, and removal of portions of the lighthouse jetty and bulkhead east thereof.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,753,000	\$3,506,000	\$5,259,000
Current.....	2,006,000	4,012,000	6,018,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will (1) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first costs of its construction; (2) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$218,000	\$212,250
Maintenance (local).....	92,000	101,500
Total.....	310,000	313,750
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	30,000	-----
Elimination of maintenance	50,000	-----
Recreational.....	250,000	-----
Total.....	330,000	371,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.1	1.2

Action by local interests: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has appropriated \$2,500,000 in 1953 to be available for the construction of the recommended project.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

SELKIRK SHORES STATE PARK, LAKE ONTARIO, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 343, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: At the southeastern corner of Lake Ontario. Study included about 1 mile of shore in the town of Richland in Oswego County, N. Y., about 15 miles northeast of Oswego Harbor.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for improving the shores of Selkirk Shores State Park.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for: (a) construction of an outlet structure at the mouth of Grindstone Creek; (b) restoration of approximately 900 feet of beach frontage by alteration of an existing groin, construction of a new groin and direct placement of about 14,000 cubic yards of sand fill, and about 11,000 cubic yards of granular base fill; and (c) construction of about 4,400 feet of roadway-type quarry-run stone revetment north of the beach areas.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$133, 600	\$267, 200	\$400, 800
Current.....	136, 500	273, 000	409, 500

Local cooperation: The improvement is recommended for Federal participation provided that the State of New York will: (1) adopt the plan of restoration and protection and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans and specifications and arrangements for prosecuting the entire work prior to commencement of such work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give satisfactory assurances that it will maintain the protective and improvement measures during their useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within its jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$14, 130	\$14, 400
Maintenance (local).....	4, 300	4, 400
Total.....	18, 430	18, 800
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	13, 100	13, 500
Recreational.....	12, 600	12, 600
Total.....	25, 700	26, 100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.39	1.39

POINT MUGU TO SAN PEDRO BREAKWATER, CALIF. (APPENDIX II)

(H. Doc. 277, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Pacific coast of California immediately west of the city of Los Angeles. The study area extends 68 miles in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties and includes the communities of Santa Monica and El Segundo.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no authorized Federal beach erosion control project in the study area.

Recommended plan of improvement: Protective features of modified master plan of Los Angeles County for shoreline development, comprising (a) widening existing beaches to approximately 1,000 feet between Topanga Canyon and Ballona Creek, and to approximately 300 feet between El Segundo and the Redondo Beach breakwater and between the proposed barrier groin at Redondo Beach and Malaga Cove; (b) immediate construction of 9 groins and 1 barrier groin; (c) deferred construction of 5 groins and 1 barrier groin if and when their need is demonstrated; (d) extension of 7 storm-drain structures

through the widened beach; and (e) rehabilitation of the Santa Monica breakwater.

Estimated costs:

	Federal ¹	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3, 099, 000	\$86, 583, 000	\$89, 682, 000
Current.....	3, 874, 000	103, 948, 000	107, 822, 000

¹ Federal share is based on $\frac{1}{3}$ of cost of protecting existing shoreline.

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (1) adopt the recommended plan, complete major segments of the plan to be eligible for Federal aid within 16 years of the date of Federal authorization, and pay all the costs of its construction other than one-third of that cost applicable to the protection of the existing shoreline; (2) submit for approval by the Chief of Engineers detailed plans, specifications, arrangement for prosecuting the entire work, and schedules for reimbursement of local interests for completed portions of the project, prior to commencement of work; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the protective measures of the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers, and continue public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization (on investment less salvage value).....	\$3, 890, 580	-----
Maintenance and operation (local).....	2, 664, 340	-----
Revenue.....	-4, 178, 740	-----
Net total.....	2, 376, 180	1, 938, 800 ^a
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	106, 000	-----
Savings in auto travel.....	228, 000	-----
Recreational.....	5, 288, 000	-----
Total.....	5, 522, 000	4, 686, 000 ^a
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.4	2.5

ANAHEIM BAY HARBOR, CALIF.

Location: On the Pacific Ocean coast of southern California, in Orange County about 4 miles southeast of the mouth of the Los Angeles River at Long Beach.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: Under a Federal project for Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, authorized by River and Harbor Act of 1871 and subsequently modified by later acts, about 8 miles of offshore breakwater have been provided, with the southern extremity of the breakwater about opposite the San Gabriel River. Under authority of Public Law 122, 80th Congress approved June 27, 1947, the Corps of Engi-

neers in 1947 deposited 1,220,000 cubic yards of sand fill on the shore east of the Anaheim Bay Harbor breakwaters.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) west of Anaheim Bay Harbor, artificial placement of approximately 200,000 cubic yards of sandfill on the shore and construction of one groin at Seal Beach; and (b) west of Anaheim Bay Harbor, placement of a feeder beach in amount of approximately 1 million cubic yards of sand at Surf Side.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1952):			
Seal Beach.....	\$62,000	\$124,000	\$186,000
Surf Side.....	86,400	213,600	300,000
Total.....	148,400	337,600	486,000
Current (fall 1953):			
Seal Beach.....	65,700	131,400	197,100
Surf Side.....	91,600	225,800	317,400
Total.....	157,300	357,200	514,500

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the projects is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended projects and pay two-thirds of the first cost of construction for non-Federal publicly owned portions and all the costs for privately owned portions of the shore; (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that they will maintain the projects during their useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution from sources within their jurisdiction, and continue public ownership of the shore and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Seal Beach:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$7,700	\$6,950
Maintenance (local).....	6,000	6,000
Total.....	13,700	12,950
Surf Side:		
Interest and amortization.....	12,420	11,190
Maintenance (local).....	80,000	80,000
Total.....	92,420	91,190
Grand total.....	106,120	104,140
Annual benefits:		
Seal Beach: Protective.....	19,500	19,500
Surf Side: Protective.....	134,000	134,000
Total.....	153,500	153,500
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Seal Beach.....	1.42	1.51
Surf Side.....	1.45	1.47

CARPINTERIA TO POINT MUGU, CALIF. (APPENDIX I)

H. Doc. 29, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: On Pacific coast of California about 75 miles northwest of Los Angeles. The study area extends 38½ miles in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties including the communities of Ventura and Port Hueneme and the deltas of the Ventura and Santa Clara Rivers.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There are no authorized Federal beach erosion control projects in the study area. However, a project to provide protection to the frontage of the Naval Air Missile Test Center at Point Mugu by bypassing sand at Port Hueneme was begun in 1953 with Navy funds.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for the construction of 3 groins in the Ventura-Pierpont area to stabilize the shoreline, with construction of the 2 updrift groins deferred until their need is demonstrated. (Protective measures for the Hueneme-Mugu area were recommended in the Port Hueneme harbor and shore protection report of 1948.)

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$53,150	\$106,300	\$159,450
Current.....	73,700	147,300	221,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (1) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first costs of its construction; (2) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (3) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (4) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers, and continue public ownership of the beaches and their administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$6,598	\$7,800
Maintenance (local).....	3,000	3,510
Total.....	9,598	11,310
Annual benefits:		
Savings in auto travel.....	2,700	-----
Increased earning power.....	12,000	-----
Total.....	14,700	15,800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.5	1.4

WAIKIKI BEACH, T. H.

(H. Doc. 227, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: In Honolulu, T. H., between Diamond Head and the entrance to Honolulu Harbor on the south shore of the island of Oahu. Study area extends over about 3½ miles of shore including Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and Ala Moana Park northwest of Waikiki Beach proper.

Report authorized by: Cooperative study provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for improvement of the shore in the study area.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for restoration of the beach by artificial placement of approximately 385,000 cubic yards of sandfill to widen the beach berm to 75 to 150 feet, and the construction of 1,200 feet of terrace wall, 2 groins and appurtenant drainage facilities, the construction of the groins and approximately 800 feet of wall to be deferred until experience indicates the need therefor.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$227,000	\$977,000	\$1,204,000
Current.....	283,700	1,221,300	1,505,000

Local cooperation: Federal participation in the project is recommended provided that local authorities (a) adopt the recommended plan and pay two-thirds of the first costs of its construction applicable to the non-Federal publicly owned portions and all of its costs applicable to privately owned portions of the shore, (b) submit to the Chief of Engineers for approval detailed plans and specifications for the work prior to its commencement; (c) provide all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and (d) give assurances that they will maintain the project during its useful life, hold and save the United States free from all claims for damages, prevent water pollution that would endanger the health of bathers, and continue public ownership of the shore upon which the Federal participation is based and its administration for public use only.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$50,420	\$53,100
Maintenance (local).....	20,000	25,000
Total.....	70,420	78,100
Annual benefits:		
Protective.....	14,600	18,200
Prevention of business loss.....	100,000	100,000
Increased earning power.....	400,000	400,000
Recreational.....	342,000	388,000
Total.....	856,600	906,200
Benefit-cost ratio.....	12.2	11.6

Action by local interests: Expended approximately \$480,000 on beach improvements in central Waikiki Beach area, including 110,000 cubic yards of beach fill, terrace wall, groins, and storm drains in 1951, and 16,000 cubic yards of fill placed shoreward of a precast, reinforced concrete, offshore wall on 1953.

Remarks: Local interests have accomplished certain work at Waikiki Beach since formulation of the recommended project, because of the urgent need for protection and improvement. This work forms a part of the recommended project.

SECTION 102

Section 102 relates to reimbursement to local interests for beach erosion-control work undertaken by them under certain circumstances. This provision is discussed at the close of the preceding general statement for Title I; Rivers and Harbors.

SECTION 103

Section 103 relates to preliminary examinations and surveys. The committee has included one river and harbor preliminary examination and survey after hearing favorable testimony thereon from the Corps of Engineers.

SECTION 104

Section 104 relates to the closing of Garrows Bend Channel, Mobile, Ala. The committee included language to permit the closing of the channel no longer needed to provide access to an offshore island at Mobile, Ala., after a favorable report had been made by the Corps of Engineers. This provision involves the expenditure of no Federal funds.

SECTION 105

Section 105 states that title I of the bill may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1954," and is included for reference purposes.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

Title II covers the flood-control projects, project modifications, basin authorization increases, and certain miscellaneous matters on which testimony has been heard by the Flood Control Subcommittee and by the full committee and which have been considered in executive session and reported favorably. They represent an orderly continuation of the flood-control program throughout the United States and its possessions, which has evolved from the 1936 Flood Control Act and subsequent acts. Included also are project modifications in connection with the great project for the lower Mississippi Valley.

The Congress and the public are now well aware of the importance of flood control and related water resources development in the growth of this Nation. Public consciousness has been increasingly educated to the need for the control of destructive floodwaters and the harnessing of their energy for beneficial use. Each passing year brings this problem more vividly to the American people. Since passage of the 1950 Flood Control Act, there have been terrible lessons taught

in this field, the most notable being that of the disastrous Kansas River flood of 1951 which wrecked the fertile valley, wiped out a part of Kansas City, and caused loss and hardship for many miles downstream. This flood caused a damage of about \$1 billion, which is many times more than the entire cost of the projects in this bill for the Kansas River Basin and approaches the total estimated cost for the overall flood-control plan for the Missouri River Basin.

Interest in a Federal flood-control program began during the middle of the last century and culminated in the formation of the Mississippi River Commission by Congress in 1879 and of the California Debris Commission in 1893. As the result of the studies made by these bodies, projects were established by law on the Sacramento River in 1917 and in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River in 1928. It was recognized that the control of a major stream system like the lower Mississippi was far beyond the ability of local communities or even States.

Flood control as a national policy was firmly established by the National Flood Control Act of 1936 which stated as a declaration of policy that floods constituted a menace to national welfare and that it is the sense of Congress that flood control is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States and local interests, where the benefits are in excess of the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected. From that beginning there has grown the important flood-control program undertaken by the United States.

The flood-control program includes 287 authorizations on which work has been fully completed at a total cost of \$545 million. At the present time there are 100 projects under way at a total estimated cost of \$1,652 million, of which \$880 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. This does not include the project for the lower Mississippi River, which has a total estimated cost of \$1,293 million, of which \$849 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. In the category of flood-control projects not yet started there is a total of 196 with an estimated cost of \$1,371 million, of which \$12 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954 for planning purposes. The total number of projects or project modifications in the active flood-control program, including the Mississippi River as 1 project, is therefore, 584, at a total estimated cost of \$4,861 million, of which \$2,286 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. In addition there are a number of projects in the authorized backlog which are considered inactive or deferred for restudy. The foregoing figures with respect to numbers of projects and estimated costs do not include a number of multiple-purpose projects which include other major functions as well as flood control.

The flood-control program undertaken by the Federal Government has already brought large returns. It is estimated that if no Federal flood-control measures had been undertaken the total average flood damages in the United States would be in excess of \$800 million a year. The Federal flood-control works now in operation prevent flood losses estimated at more than \$300 million a year, and a considerable amount of flood damage is prevented by works constructed by local interests. The remaining average annual flood damage actually experienced in this country totals, therefore, about \$500 million a year under the present state of development.

The committee has carefully considered the testimony by the Corps of Engineers and by local interests on all the projects included in the bill. They range from local channel and levee works to large multiple-purpose river basin developments. They are scattered throughout the United States and some are located in Alaska and Hawaii. The total number of new flood-control projects and increased monetary authorizations in this title is 39, and the total estimated cost to the United States is \$663,352,750. In considering the estimated additional cost, the committee has subtracted the cost of projects already authorized from the total cost of the new projects in this bill in those cases where a presently authorized project would be modified or replaced.

SECTION 201

Section 201 is the same as that which appeared in the last flood control bill (May 17, 1950) and in previous legislation. It covers matters of local cooperation.

SECTION 202

Section 202 is the same as the section which appeared in the last flood control act (May 17, 1950) and in preceding legislation. It covers general matters pertaining to requirements governing the submission of reports to Congress.

SECTION 203

Section 203 authorizes new projects and increases the monetary authorization under existing comprehensive basin plans previously authorized by Congress. The preliminary language in the section covers the general provisions with respect to project authorization and other features, and is the same as the language in previous flood control legislation. The individual items, together with the project document numbers and the estimated costs, are summarized in the following table, and are discussed in detail in succeeding paragraphs.

	Document No. ¹	New flood control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Connecticut River Basin:			
Modification of project to provide for Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H.			
Modification of plan for West River Basin, Vt.			
Susquehanna River, vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.	H. 500, 81st Cong.	\$4,469,000	
Central and Southern Florida (modification of project).	II. 643, 80th Cong.		\$7,000,000
Lower Mississippi River:			
Control of Old and Atebafalaya Rivers and lock for navigation.	(²)	32,000,000	
Channel in Old and Atebafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, La.	S. 53, 82d Cong.	440,000	
Modification of project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area.	H. 85, 83d Cong.		
Modification of project for New Madrid floodway.	H. 183, 83d Cong.	1,743,000	
Buffalo Bayou Basin, flood protection at Houston, Tex.	H. 250, 83d Cong.	16,191,600	
Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex.	H. 535, 81st Cong.	40,000,000	
Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex.	H. 344, 83d Cong.	30,254,000	
Guadalupe River, Tex. (modification of project for Canyon Dam).			
Rio Grande Basin:			
At Albuquerque, N. Mex.	H. 464, 83d Cong.	7,500,000	
At Roswell, N. Mex., on Rio Hondo River	H. 436, 83d Cong.	5,658,000	
White River Basin: Modification of plan for Greers Ferry Reservoir, Ark., and authorization of Beaver Reservoir, Ark.	(³)		
Arkansas River and tributaries, at Enid, Okla.	H. 185, 83d Cong.	965,000	
Upper Mississippi River:			
Urban areas at Alton, Ill.	H. 397, 83d Cong.	2,500,000	
Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill.	H. 281, 83d Cong.	30,551,000	
Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, No. 8, Monroe County, Ill.	II. 396, 83d Cong.	480,000	
Sny Island levee, Levee Drainage District, Ill.	H. 247, 83d Cong.	7,046,300	
Upper Iowa River, Iowa	H. Doc. 375, 83d Cong.	979,600	
Missouri River Basin authorization			144,000,000
Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas.	H. 642, 81st Cong.	73,710,000	
Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, modification of project.			
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., modification of project.	H. 549, 81st Cong.		
Charitan River, Iowa and Missouri	H. 561, 81st Cong.	19,612,000	
Little Sioux River, Iowa	S. 127, 83d Cong.	10,076,000	
Little Missouri River and tributaries at Mar-marth, N. Dak.	S. 134, 81st Cong.	212,300	
Coal Creek and tributaries, Tenn.	H. 154, 82d Cong.	745,200	
Ohio River Basin: Sandy Liek Creek, vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pa.	H. 716, 81st Cong.	570,000	
Paint Rock River, Ala.	H. —, 83d Cong.	1,001,300	
Kalamazoo River, Mich.	S. 98, 83d Cong.	4,201,550	
Little Calumet River, Ind.	H. 153, 82d Cong.	509,900	
Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek, Calif.			12,500,000
Sacramento River Basin:			
Middle Creek, Calif.	H. 367, 81st Cong.	1,110,000	
American River, Calif.	H. 367, 81st Cong.	1,600,000	
Lower San Joaquin River Basin			5,000,000
Columbia River Basin: Modification of project to include power development at Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oreg., and Green Peter Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg., including White Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg.	II. 531, 81st Cong.		180,000,000
Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska	II. 54, 82d Cong.	380,000	
Wailoa Stream and its tributaries, island of Hawaii, T. H.	H. 529, 81st Cong.	347,000	
Department of Agriculture, sec. 205, prosecution of works heretofore authorized.			20,000,000
Total		294,852,750	368,500,000

¹ "H" indicates House Document; "S" indicates Senate document.² Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Apr. 8, 1954.³ Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Feb. 19, 1954.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

RESERVOIR ON OTTER BROOK, SOUTH KEENE, N. H.

Location: The proposed Otter Brook Reservoir is located on Otter Brook, the principal tributary of The Branch, which in turn is a tributary of the Ashuelot River. The dam site is 4.9 miles above the confluence of The Branch with the Ashuelot River and is in the city of Keene in southwestern New Hampshire.

Authority: The Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the basic plan for the Connecticut River Basin which consisted of 10 reservoirs. This was modified by the 1937, 1938, and 1941 acts as the result of which the approved plan was expanded to include 10 additional reservoirs. Under the language of the reports referred to in these acts, substitute sites up to a total of 10 may be considered as authorized for substitution in the event that some of the original 20 prove to be infeasible. Otter Brook Reservoir was not actually included in the list making up the 20 approved projects. It is, however, in the category of a possible substitute. That project also is included in the Connecticut River Interstate Compact which was approved by Congress on June 6, 1953.

Plan of improvement: Otter Brook Reservoir to be considered as an alternative site in the comprehensive flood-control plan for the Connecticut River Basin. Dam to be constructed of rolled earth with concrete spillway in the right abutment.

Estimated cost:

1953 price levels-----	\$4, 800, 000
------------------------	---------------

Project economics:

Annual charges-----	\$197, 000
Annual benefits-----	230, 000
Benefit-cost ratio-----	1. 2

Remarks: The committee noted that Otter Brook Reservoir is a feasible project which was studied in a comprehensive plan for control of floods in the Connecticut River Basin. The project has been included in the Connecticut River compact. The State of New Hampshire and local interests are desirous of starting construction of Otter Brook as soon as possible. The committee considers that the substitution of Otter Brook Reservoir for one of the other authorized reservoirs is warranted.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF THREE RESERVOIRS IN WEST RIVER BASIN OF THE CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN AS SUBSTITUTION FOR WILLIAMSVILLE RESERVOIR

The comprehensive plan for the Connecticut River Basin as set forth in House Document 455, 75th Congress, 2d session, and approved in the Flood Control Act of 1938 included the Newfane Reservoir for the control of the West River in Vermont. This reservoir provided 105,000 acre-feet of storage for a drainage area of 326 square miles, or an equivalent of 6 inches of run-off. The Newfane Reservoir was later eliminated from the system of reservoirs in the Connecticut River Basin plan by the substitution of the Williamsville Reservoir. The authorization for this change is contained in the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, which modified the plan for the

Connecticut River Basin by substituting the reservoirs recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document 724, 76th Congress, 3d session, and shown on the list printed in that document. Williamsville Reservoir would have controlled a drainage area of 400 square miles and would have had a capacity of 150,000 acre-feet, equivalent to 7 inches of run-off. The Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 authorized the substitution for the Williamsville Reservoir of a system of eight reservoirs in the West River Basin in accordance with the plan submitted by the Vermont State Water Conservation Board, as it might be modified by agreement among the Board, the Secretary of the Army, and the Chief of Engineers. A plan was developed by the Board and reviewed by the Corps of Engineers. A rough cost estimate, based on field reconnaissance made by the Corps of Engineers, indicated that the eight reservoir plan would cost about \$16,500,000, based on price levels as of the period 1940-42. Additional studies were made, culminating in an estimate in 1947 based upon more adequate field and office engineering investigations, of approximately \$30 million. If that estimate is increased to present-day prices based on the ratio between present construction cost indexes and 1947 construction cost indexes or approximately 150 percent, the estimate would be approximately \$45 million.

In view of the excessive costs of a large number of small reservoirs as presented in the Vermont plan, the Vermont State Water Conservation Board informally agreed that further studies for flood control in the West River Basin be directed to several alternative sites on the main river above Newfane, identified as The Island, Ball Mountain, and Townshend. Various combinations were tested in an effort to obtain, if possible, an alternative plan to the Vermont eight-reservoir plan which would still meet the requirements concerning flood-control effect contemplated in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The plan found to approach the requirements of cost limitation and flood control effect most closely would consist of the one now approved and agreed to by the Secretary of the Army and Corps of Engineers and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board. The 3 reservoirs referred to previously would provide storage capacity of 107,000 acre-feet, equivalent to 7.2 inches of runoff from the controlled drainage area of 278 square miles. This storage is 72 percent of the storage of the Williamsville Reservoir and the flood-control effect would be more than the 75 percent set forth in the 1944 Flood Control Act. The benefits from flood control for the proposed 3-reservoir plan are approximately equivalent to about 80 percent of the flood-control benefits from the earlier Williamsville plan. With respect to the cost limitations of \$11 million in the 1944 act, that was based on estimates made by the State on 1940-42 price levels. The increase in the construction costs as shown by the Engineering News-Record index between current costs and the average of the 1940-42 period is approximately 240 percent. The present cost estimate of the 3 alternative dams is \$27,930,000, which represents an increase of approximately 254 percent over the amount set forth in the 1944 act. The substitution of the 3 reservoirs, therefore, for the 8 reservoirs referred to in the 1944 act which, in turn, were a substitution for Williamsville Reservoir, meets closely the intent of Congress in the 1944 act in that the amount of storage provided is slightly more

in beneficial effect than the 75 percent stated in the 1944 act, and the cost is only slightly greater than the increase due to price level changes.

In recognition of this general situation, a resolution was passed by this committee on April 20, 1948, stating that it was the opinion of the committee that the modified plan for flood control in the West River Basin, Vt., consisting of The Island, upper Ball Mountain and upper Townshend Reservoirs, as agreed upon by the Army engineers and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board, meets the intent of Congress as expressed in the 1944 Flood Control Act with respect to that basin. In furtherance of the adoption of the substitute plan, an agreement between the Corps of Engineers and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board confirming the adoption of the three-reservoir plan was signed by the Board and the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of the Army in the summer of 1950.

Although the committee feels that the three-reservoir plan may be considered authorized, since it meets closely the intent of the authorization in the 1944 act with respect to cost and flood protection if proper account is taken of the benefits from the plan and the change in price levels, the committee has, nevertheless, included in the bill specific authorization for this agreed-upon plan because of the physical nature of the changes from the 8-reservoir plan to the 3-reservoir plan, and because of the increase in construction costs since the earlier authorization.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF ENDICOTT, JOHNSON CITY,
AND VESTAL, N. Y.

(H. Doc. 500, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: North Branch Susquehanna River rises in Otsego Lake near Cooperstown, N. Y., flows 123 miles to Binghamton, N. Y., thence 200 miles to Sunbury, Pa., where it is joined by West Branch to form Susquehanna River. The main stem flows 123 miles to Chesapeake Bay at Havre de Grace, Md. Johnson City is on the right bank downstream from and adjacent to Binghamton. Endicott is also on right bank 8 miles west of Binghamton. Vestal is located on left bank of river opposite Endicott.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of 1944; resolutions House Flood Control Committee, December 18, 1945, and July 5, 1946, and resolution Senate Commerce Committee, January 14, 1946.

Plan of recommended improvement: Local improvements for flood protection at and in vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y., against a design flow of 126,000 cubic feet per second. The works involved would consist of rolled earth-fill levees, reinforced concrete flood walls, drainage outlet structures, pumping stations, ponding areas, and highway and railroad closures.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,812,000	\$777,000	\$4,589,000
Current.....	4,469,000	909,000	5,378,000

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make utility changes, ramp streets over levees, restore all streets and roads affected by construction, provide necessary pumping facilities; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization	\$184,300	\$189,200
Maintenance (local)	15,300	17,800
Total	199,600	207,000
Annual benefits:		
With 2 reservoirs in operation	189,600	349,000
With 7 reservoirs in operation	140,900	294,600
Benefit-cost ratio:		
With 2 reservoirs in operation	0.96	¹ 1.69
With 7 reservoirs in operation	.71	¹ 1.42

¹ Based on current prices and system analysis of authorized reservoirs and proposed local protection, as used in pending North Branch comprehensive report; benefit-cost ratios of 0.90 and 1.21 with 2 and 7 reservoirs in operation, at current prices, using residual basis of benefits for local protection as in H. Doc. 500, 81st Cong.

Remarks: A comprehensive review report for the North Branch of the Susquehanna River is nearing completion and is scheduled for early submission to the Congress. The committee heard testimony to the effect that this report, like the report in House document 500, 81st Congress, had found the improvements at Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal to be necessary. This later comprehensive report had indicated also that the improvements concerned were economically justified by a wide margin. In view of these facts and in view of the past record of the communities concerned with respect to damaging floods, the committee was convinced that the project recommended by House Document 500, 81st Congress, should be authorized as early as possible.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF IMPROVEMENT FOR CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

Location and description: The area under consideration embraces some 15,570 square miles in central and southern Florida. Development and settlement of this area has progressed in spite of the difficulties inherent in a land where there is either too much or too little water. Hurricane-driven floods of 1926 and 1928 resulted in the loss of some 2,500 lives in the area around Lake Okeechobee. The flood of 1947 caused damage estimated at \$59 million during the summer and fall of that year even though overflow from Lake Okeechobee was prevented by Federal protective works.

Existing comprehensive plan: The first phase of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes, involving expansion and modification of the projects for the Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1948. Further monetary authorization was approved by the Flood Control Act of 1950, making the total \$36,300,000. The plan provides for protection and control works needed to prevent destructive flooding as well as the related major drainage outlets, control

structures and water conservation facilities. The works are generally designed to provide protection from a storm similar to that of 1947.

Project and status:

Comprehensive plan, phase I, 12 percent complete on June 30, 1953— *Estimated cost*
\$96,345,900

Local cooperation: Lands, easements, and rights-of-way; contribute 15 percent of the construction cost, not to exceed \$29,152,000; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and operation of the works; maintain and operate all works after completion except the levees, channels, locks, and control works of the St. Lucie Canal, Lake Okeechobee, and Caloosahatchee River and the main spillways of the conservation areas.

Benefits: The plan as a whole and each of its major features are multiple-purpose in concept and design. Accordingly, each feature of the plan contributes to the realization of the primary benefits through flood protection, drainage, and control of water. Analysis of the benefits and costs of the plan shows that it is justified economically.

Existing authorization and status: The existing project was authorized by the following flood control acts, with the amount of authorization as indicated:

Flood Control Act, June 30, 1948-----	\$16,300,000
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950-----	20,000,000
Total -----	36,300,000

Through fiscal year 1954, Congress has made available funds in the amount of \$18,774,000. The civil functions bill, 1955, as passed by the House contained funds in the amount of \$3,620,000 for continuation of construction on projects in the comprehensive plan, making total appropriations to date of \$22,394,000. This amount subtracted from the total authorization to date, leaves a balance of available monetary authorization for future appropriations of \$13,906,000.

Additional authorization: The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers, that based upon its 6-year program for expenditures in Florida, sufficient authorization would not be available to cover the full appropriation in fiscal year 1957 by approximately \$7 million. The committee has therefore included this additional amount of authorization in the bill in order that the prosecution of the comprehensive plan might proceed in an efficient and orderly manner.

The Congress, during its deliberations prior to the authorization of the 1948 Flood Control Act, considered the comprehensive plan for the extensive central and southern Florida area as recommended in House Document 643, 81st Congress. The 1948 Flood Control Act authorized a first phase of this plan and the Senate Report 1568 referring thereto contained comment as follows: "Due to the press of time, the committee has deemed it desirable to reserve its approval of the entire comprehensive plan, pending more adequate opportunity to analyze thoroughly all aspects of the plan."

The first phase so authorized provided for the construction of the more important units in 2 of the 4 areas embraced by the comprehensive plan. Construction of certain of these units has been completed or is underway. Planning has been continued on all areas of the

project, though detailed plans for all units have not yet been crystallized.

During hearings on this project the committee was impressed with the fact that the current authorization limited work to specific areas, whereas residents of the entire project area were forced to share a portion of the cost. It noted that the present limited authorization might preclude the undertaking of work in areas where the most urgent need exists. It noted, also, that the basis for cooperation to be expected from local interests, as recommended in House Document No. 643, though calling upon local interests for substantial work and the furnishing of a cash contribution, did not conform exactly with policies now in force for review and recommendation on similar projects. The committee heard testimony from representatives of the Corps of Engineers who explained that investigation and planning were underway for all areas but, in view of the complexity of the project, a firm establishment of all features, with related firm cost estimates was not possible at the present time; a revised basis for local contribution in line with current policy could not be clearly defined at present but that, in the near future, the crystallization of plans would permit a reasonable reevaluation; and, if the entire project were authorized, separable areas should be undertaken only if economically justified. In view of all of these factors it was the opinion of the committee that the entire project as recommended in House Document No. 693 should be authorized at this time; it should be realized that substantial modification in certain units might be necessary as basic information and detailed plans were further developed; as soon as the status of planning permits, the Chief of Engineers should submit to the Congress through the Bureau of the Budget, appropriate recommendations for revision of the basis of local cooperation; this basis should be applicable retroactively to any units authorized by this present act, but not authorized by prior acts, to include any newly authorized units undertaken prior to the time of establishment of the revised basis of contribution. Meanwhile local contributions for such additional units should be made ad interim, on the same basis as for units of the authorized first phase.

The committee intends that the so-called outer encirclement levee be constructed in accordance with plans of the Chief of Engineers in the area south of Lake Okeechobee in place of certain levees (inner encirclement) included in the originally authorized first phase and also that work be undertaken as plans are developed for the St. Johns and Kissimee River area, as well as for other areas where changes may be required as a result of detailed engineering planning and design.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN

The title "Lower Mississippi River Basin" applies to the comprehensive project for flood control and improvement of the Mississippi River in its Alluvial Valley authorized by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress. The Alluvial Valley of the Mississippi River extends from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Gulf of Mexico and comprises about 30,000 square miles. It is located in the 7 States of Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana and receives the drainage from all or part of 31 States of the Union comprising 41 percent of the area

of the United States. Since it was originally adopted in the 1928 act the basic project has been modified and supplemented a number of times, to include tributary streams within the Alluvial Valley such as the St. Francis, Yazoo, Lower White and Lower Arkansas, and the Atchafalaya River outlet and alluvial lands around Lake Pontchartrain.

The lead-off paragraph under this title amends the basic act of 1928, as amended, to include the new or modified items set forth in the subparagraphs that follow and increases the authorization for the comprehensive project accordingly.

Subparagraph (a) would definitely authorize the control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and the construction of a navigation lock substantially as outlined in the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated February 2, 1954, and concurred in by the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1954. These reports are concerned with determining and recommending the best means of preventing the Mississippi River from diverting all or a major portion of its flow through the Atchafalaya River to the Gulf of Mexico. This physical change in the regimen of the Mississippi River has been under surveillance for many years and has been reported on several times in the past half century. The most recent study made in 1951, based on voluminous engineering and geological data concluded unanimously that the Mississippi River, if left alone, would adopt the channel of the Atchafalaya River, a much shorter route to the gulf. The 1954 reports accordingly recommend that the existing project for the lower Mississippi River be amended and modified to clearly provide for the control of flows from the Mississippi River into the Atchafalaya River and Basin by mechanically operated control structures on the right bank of the Mississippi River. A later report will be made on the characteristics and cost of the navigation lock required in connection with the closing of Old River, the natural connection between the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers.

The estimated cost of this work as set forth in the report (exclusive of the navigation lock) is \$47 million. Since there was reasonable doubt whether or not a structure was authorized for the control of these rivers in the 1950 act the present bill clarifies the language to require that \$15 million of the increased monetary authorization made in subparagraph (a) under the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, shall be applied to this work and authorizes an additional \$32 million at this time to provide the necessary authorization of \$47 million. This subparagraph also provides that the United States shall acquire such lands, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas as may be necessary for construction of the work except that local interests shall comply with existing law with respect to the enlargement and extension of the main line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, La.; that no flowage rights are to be acquired by the United States in connection with this item of work; and that when the type and dimensions of the required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engineers construction thereof may be initiated with the funds authorized.

Subparagraph (b) would authorize dredging in the lower Atchafalaya River to provide an adequate year round channel 12 feet deep with a bottom width of 125 feet substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$440,000.

Subparagraph (c) would authorize a modification of the Vicksburg-Yazoo area project, previously authorized in subparagraph (o) of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 85, 83d Congress. No additional monetary authorization is required for this item since the modification recommended can be accomplished within the monetary authorization made in the Flood Control Act of 1946.

Subparagraph (d) would authorize a modification of the Birds Point-New Madrid Floodway, which is an integral part of the comprehensive lower Mississippi River project, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 183, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,743,000.

Detailed project data on these items follow.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

OLD RIVER CONTROL

(Report of Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1954)

Location: Old River departs from the Mississippi River at mile 302 above Head of Passes in Louisiana.

Report authorized by: Section 6 of River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935.

Existing project: The project for flood control and improvement of the Mississippi River and tributaries, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for two mechanically operated control structures on the right bank of the Mississippi River approximately at mile 312 above Head of Passes, a navigation lock, enlargement and extension of the main river levee from Black Hawk to and across Old River to Terras, and bank stabilization as required in the Red and Atchafalaya Rivers.

Estimated cost (exclusive of lock):

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Current.....	\$46, 741, 000	\$10, 000	\$46, 751, 000

Project economics:

	<i>Current</i>
Annual charges.....	\$1, 880, 865
Annual benefits.....	14, 600, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	7. 7

Remarks: Before estimating the type, dimensions and cost of the lock that will be required at Old River, the Mississippi River Commission is making a detailed study of the trends and type of navigation that will use the lock.

ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, LA.

(S. Doc. 53, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: The Atchafalaya River is located west of the Mississippi River in Louisiana and extends from the mouth of the Red River in a southerly direction to the Gulf of Mexico.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted September 23, 1949.

Existing project: The project for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for an adequate channel 12 feet deep at mean low water over a bottom width of 125 feet from the Mississippi River via Old River to Morgan City, La.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$400,000	0	\$440,000
Current.....	440,000	0	440,000

Local cooperation: All lands, easements, and rights-of-way have been obtained for the existing flood control project. None will be needed for the low water navigation channel.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$168,000	\$136,000
Annual benefits.....	202,000	160,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.20	1.20

VICKSBURG-YAZOO AREA

(H. Doc. 85, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Immediately north of Vicksburg, Miss., between the Illinois Central Railroad and the Yazoo diversion canal.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted December 14, 1950.

Existing project: Protection of the Vicksburg-Yazoo area was authorized by Public Law 526, 79th Congress as a feature of the project for flood control and improvement of the Mississippi River and tributaries. The present proposal is a substitute plan—at somewhat less cost than the \$4 million stated in Public Law 526.

Plan of recommended improvement: A 245-acre industrial fill above flood stage, a harbor channel and approach channel, suitable highway and railway connections and drainage rearrangements.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,220,000	\$120,000	\$3,340,000
Current.....	3,220,000	707,500	3,927,500

Local cooperation: Provide lands and rights-of-way, spoil-disposal areas, road, and utility relocations for construction and subsequent maintenance, construct and operate terminal facilities, maintain and operate all works after completion except harbor and approach channels.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$171,000	\$148,000
Annual benefits.....	700,000	700,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	4.1	4.7

NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO.

(H. Doc. 183, 83d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: The New Madrid Floodway is situated on the west bank of the Mississippi River between Birds Point, Mo. (mile 964) and New Madrid, Mo. (mile 895).

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted April 18, 1951.

Existing project: The existing Mississippi River and tributaries project adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, provides for the New Madrid Floodway having a setback levee, and a frontline levee with an upper and lower fuse-plug section. The present proposal is a modification of the existing project.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of a new levee extending about 1,800 feet from the lower fuse-plug section across the existing gap therein to the setback levee, enlargement of 2,400 feet of frontline fuse-plug levee and construction of a floodgate for release of interior drainage.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$1,556,000	\$9,000	\$1,565,000
Current.....	1,734,000	9,000	1,743,000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; acquire and provide without cost to the United States flowage rights and easements; hold and save United States free from damages resulting from construction or use as a floodway; and maintain and operate improvements in accordance with the act of May 15, 1928 as amended.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$75,300	\$74,000
Annual benefits.....	183,000	159,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.4	2.16

BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES—FLOOD PROTECTION FOR
HOUSTON, TEX.

(H. Doc. 250, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Buffalo Bayou rises in the coastal prairie of southeastern Texas, flows generally eastward 75 miles, passing through Houston, and joins San Jacinto River about 9 miles above Galveston Bay. White Oak Bayou joins Buffalo Bayou from the north near the center of the city. Brays Bayou joins Buffalo Bayou at mile 14.

Report authorized by: Resolutions of House Public Works Committee, July 16, 1945, and April 20, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for protection of Houston from flood damages and prevention of silt deposits in Houston turning basin by means of detention reservoirs, channel enlargement, and rectification, control works, and any advisable diversion, at Federal cost not to exceed \$9 million for construction, subject to certain requirements of local cooperation.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for Barker and Addicks Reservoirs on Buffalo Bayou; clearing, straightening, enlarging, and lining where necessary on Buffalo, Brays, and White Oak Bayous.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$37,197,000	\$27,302,000	\$64,499,000
Current (September 1953).....	38,497,000	28,917,000	67,414,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas required for channel improvements and reimburse United States for cost of lands for existing rectified channel below reservoirs; bear cost of all highway, utility and sewer changes; hold and save United States free from damage; maintain and operate channel improvements after completion, including existing 7.4 miles of channel rectification work below reservoirs, except dredging work for maintaining desilting basin and Federal navigation project in Buffalo Bayou; establish and enforce building limit along all improved channels.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Federal.....	\$1,456,000	\$1,474,000
Non-Federal.....	1,437,000	1,188,700
Total.....	2,893,000	2,662,700
Annual benefits.....	3,677,000	4,112,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.27	1.54

Remarks: The committee noted that certain works have been completed already under a prior authorization and that these will give a measure of protection against high flows along Buffalo Bayou. It heard testimony explaining the degree of protection already given by

the partially completed project and on the impracticability of proceeding further with the plan already authorized. The committee concluded that the revised project recommended by House Document 250, 83d Congress, should be adopted in full. In reaching this conclusion it noted: That the earlier authorized project on White Oak Bayou was precluded from accomplishment by developments there; that the area along Brays Bayou, which was to receive no protection under the earlier plan had been materially developed since that plan had been authorized; and that the combined flows of White Oak and Buffalo Bayous pass through the heart of the city of Houston and therefore should be given a very high measure of control. The current estimated Federal cost of accomplishment of the presently authorized plan is \$22,305,400, while the estimated Federal cost of accomplishment of the revised plan recommended by House Document 250, 83d Congress is \$38,497,000. The estimated increased cost to the Federal Government, therefore, is \$16,191,600.

BRAZOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OYSTER CREEK AND JONES CREEK,
TEX.

(H. Doc. 535, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Brazos River rises in eastern New Mexico and flows southeasterly 1,210 miles to Gulf of Mexico near Freeport, Tex. Oyster Creek, formerly a tributary of Brazos River, now drains directly to Gulf east of Brazos. Jones Creek drains small area south of Brazos to Intracoastal Waterway. Brazos basin contains 41,997 square miles in Texas and 2,673 square miles in New Mexico; total area 44,670 square miles.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1937, River and Harbor Acts of 1937 and 1945, and three River and Harbor committee resolutions of September 1944.

Existing project: Provides for Whitney Reservoir for flood control, water supply, and power; Belton Reservoir for flood control and conservation; local protection project at Eastland and on Mill Creek; navigation improvement on lower river (Freeport Harbor).

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for additional reservoirs for flood control and conservation at Waco on Bosque River, Proctor on Leon River, Lampasas on Lampasas River, Laneport on San Gabriel River, Somerville on Yegua Creek, and Ferguson on Navasota River; modification of Belton Reservoir for power; local protection works at Lampasas and for Burleson County Improvement District No. 1.

Estimated cost:

	Project document (1949)	Current (July 1953)
New reservoirs and Belton modification.....	¹ \$118,203,000	¹ \$137,193,400
Lampasas channel improvement.....	² 1,057,000	² 1,017,000
Burleson County levee.....	² 3,324,000	² 3,254,000
Total.....	122,584,000	141,465,000

¹ Includes undetermined local contribution for conservation.

² Federal cost.

Local cooperation: For reservoirs, contribute on basis of conservation storage. For local improvements, furnish lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages; maintain and operate.

Project economics:

	Reservoirs	Lampasas	Burleson
Annual charges.....	\$5, 400, 000	\$38, 100	\$120, 900
Annual benefits.....	6, 400, 150	55, 070	203, 970
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 19	1. 45	1. 69

Remarks: The plan of H. Doc. 535, 81st Congress, provides for a comprehensive program in the interest of flood control, water conservation and hydroelectric power for the 45,000 square-mile Brazos Basin. It will give, when completed, a reasonable degree of flood protection to the larger developed areas subject to disastrous inundation. It will provide from the reservoirs of the plan, much needed conservation storage of waters for municipal and agricultural purposes and for maximum development of hydroelectric power in the reservoirs concerned insofar as is justified at this time. The committee noted the Bureau of the Budget recommendation that local interests should contract at an early date to reimburse the Federal Government for water conservation benefits resultant from the reservoirs of the program. The committee agrees that such reimbursement must be made. Though considering the entire project as warranted for authorization at this time, the committee believes that the monetary limitation on appropriations for the present should be established at \$40 million.

GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEX.

(H. Doc. 344, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: The Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins lie in south-central Texas and extend about 210 miles northwesterly from San Antonio Bay, an arm of the Gulf of Mexico.

Report authorized by: Two resolutions of House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, adopted April 8, 1938, and March 29, 1945; Rivers and Harbors Act approved June 20, 1938.

Existing project: Provides for construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir on Guadalupe River; and construction of a navigation channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide extending 46 miles from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to a point 3 miles above Victoria.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of Gonzales Dam and Reservoir on lower San Marcos River for flood control and water conservation; channel improvement project on San Antonio River, and San Pedro, Apache, Alazan and Martinez Creeks at San Antonio; channel improvement project on Escondido Creek at Kenedy.

Estimated cost:

Project document	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Gonzales Dam.....	\$12,530,000	\$4,715,000	\$17,245,000
Channel improvements (San Antonio).....	12,565,000	7,870,000	20,435,000
Channel improvements (Kenedy).....	157,500	27,500	185,000
Current (July 1953):			
Gonzales Dam.....	15,330,000	5,670,000	21,000,000
Channel improvements (San Antonio).....	14,738,000	9,240,000	23,978,000
Channel improvements (Kenedy).....	186,000	32,600	218,600

Local cooperation: For Gonzales Dam, reimburse Federal Government 27 percent of actual cost (\$4,715,000); for channel improvements at San Antonio and Kenedy, furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, purchase and removal of structures (except railroad bridges) and utility lines; hold and save the United States free from damage; maintain and operate all work after completion; for channel improvement at San Antonio, contribute in cash 2.65 percent of actual cost (\$342,000).

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges:		
Gonzales Dam.....	\$745,600	\$810,400
Channel improvements (San Antonio).....	896,400	891,500
Channel improvements (Kenedy).....	7,800	8,500
Annual benefits:		
Gonzales Dam.....	761,200	978,525
Channel improvements (San Antonio).....	961,350	1,111,340
Channel improvements (Kenedy).....	9,490	11,100
Benefit-cost ratio:		
Gonzales Dam.....	1.02	1.21
Channel improvements (San Antonio).....	1.07	1.25
Channel improvements (Kenedy).....	1.22	1.31

Remarks: The Gonzales Reservoir will effect a high measure of flood control on the Guadalupe River and, in addition, will provide conservation benefits for which local interests will be expected to make reimbursement. The San Antonio improvements will give a high degree of protection to a metropolitan area which has been subject to disastrous floods and heavy loss of life in the past, while the Kenedy project will care for a city which has been subject to frequent damaging inundation. The committee considers that all elements of this plan should be authorized at this time.

GUADALUPE RIVER, TEX. (CANYON DAM)

This project was authorized for flood control, water conservation and the possible addition of hydroelectric power by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, to provide a capacity of 563,000 acre-feet. No local cooperation on account of water conservation was required.

During the course of planning, subsequent to authorization, the Corps of Engineers has considered various sizes and designs of project, particularly an increased size of project designed to provide 59,200 kilowatts of power, and 1,144,000 acre-feet of gross storage at a cost of \$32,727,000. However, the Corps of Engineers according to testimony, has now decided—

(a) That the provision of hydroelectric power does not meet current criteria and should not be carried out at this time by the Federal Government.

(b) That the dam should be built to a gross capacity of 741,000 acre-feet, at a cost of \$13,303,000.

(c) That a larger local contribution would be appropriate.

Testimony by various interests of the State of Texas, and particularly by the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority, indicates that the dam is of high priority for flood control and water conservation, and that the authority wishes to sponsor its construction in cooperation with the Federal Government, paying initially the incremental cost of water conservation storage, and by later payments the full proportionate or allocated cost, depending upon the storage yield actually developed by the project. The authority also wishes to have the opportunity to pay for installation of power facilities at the dam at no expense to the Federal Government, paying the allocated power cost at that time.

The committee feels that this proposal represents a worthy new development, exemplifying a partnership between Federal and State agencies in the developing of water resources. The committee notes with approbation the use by the Corps of Engineers in this connection of new and improved methods of cost allocation, developed by agreement between the agencies primarily concerned, which assures an equitable sharing of the cost between reimbursable and nonreimbursable project purposes. This more specific development of economic principles allows the committee to act on proposals such as this with greater assurances that the execution of the project will be in accordance with the intentions of the committee.

The committee also notes that the new economic criteria for initiation of Federal hydroelectric development are apparently conservative, since the Guadalupe-Blanco Authority in this case contemplates development of the power plant which by latest Federal criteria is reported as marginal.

The project as now recommended lies within the scope of the original authorization, and reduces the cost of the project by almost \$20 million below the cost of the multiple-purpose project which might otherwise have been recommended.

RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., AND VICINITY

(H. Doc. 464, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: City of Albuquerque is on left bank of the Rio Grande in central New Mexico. Report concerned principally with flood discharges of the tributary, ephemeral streams which rise in Sandia Mountains to the east.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 2, 1950; House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 11, 1952.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of 2 diversion channels with combined length of about 15 miles.

Estimated cost (May 1953):

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
North diversion channel.....	\$6,265,900	\$2,070,500	\$8,336,400
South diversion channel.....	1,212,600	716,200	1,928,800
Total.....	7,478,500	2,786,700	10,265,200

Local cooperation: Contribute in cash 1.3 percent of total first cost of the north channel and 3.4 percent of total first cost of the south channel, \$104,700 and \$65,300, respectively; provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damage; maintain and operate works after completion; make alterations, other than to railroads; prevent further encroachment on existing defined waterways of the tributaries or otherwise prevent worsening of flood problem in the heights area.

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges:		
North diversion channel.....	\$329,900	\$329,900
South diversion channel.....	74,900	74,900
Annual benefits:		
North diversion channel.....	1,002,300	1,002,300
South diversion channel.....	118,600	118,600
Benefit-cost ratio:		
North diversion channel.....	3.04	3.04
South diversion channel.....	1.58	1.58

Remarks: The committee noted that authorized projects along the Rio Grande will give a measure of protection to the city from the high waters of the river, but that a major portion of the industrial and business section of the city still is threatened by flash floods originating in the Sandia Mountains. This project would give reasonable protection against the latter type of floods.

RIO HONDO AT ROSWELL, N. MEX.

(H. Doc. 436, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rio Hondo, a major tributary of the Pecos River, is formed by the confluence of Rio Ruidoso and Rio Bonito in southeastern Lincoln County, N. Mex.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of a dam on Rio Hondo and one on Rocky Arroyo to form single reservoir.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (May 1950).....	\$4,799,000	\$97,300	\$4,896,300
Current (June 1953).....	5,658,000	114,700	5,772,700

Local cooperation: Furnish to the United States, in accordance with accepted land acquisition policies, all lands necessary for construction of the reservoir; obtain necessary rights-of-way for and construct an

all-weather access road to project area; maintain access road after completion of dams; maintain present channel capacities in Rio Hondo between dam site and mile 12, and in Rocky Arroyo between dam site and the mouth; hold and save the United States free from damage, including any effects on underground and surface water supplies in Rio Hondo Basin and along Pecos River.

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$172, 990	\$203, 200
Maintenance.....	33, 300	39, 190
Total.....	206, 290	242, 390
Annual benefits: Prevention of damages.....	228, 900	281, 090
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.11	1.16

Remarks: The committee heard testimony indicating that the city of Roswell, the adjacent agricultural areas, and Walker Air Force Base were all subject to heavy damage from floods on the Rio Hondo, and that a high degree of protection against such floods could be realized from the proposed Two Rivers Reservoir.

WHITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS

(Chief of Engineers' report, February 19, 1954)

Location: Rises in northwestern Arkansas, flows north into Missouri, then southeast through Missouri and Arkansas to join the Mississippi River 583 miles above Head of Passes, La.

Report authorized by: Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution of January 24, 1939; Commerce Committee resolution of February 8, 1939; House Flood Control Committee resolution of April 5, 1940; House Flood Control Committee resolution of October 8, 1945.

Existing project: Two navigation projects on White River; inactive navigation projects on Black and Current Rivers; 14 local protection projects; a levee at Clarendon, Ark.; minor snagging and clearing projects on various tributaries; and a system of 8 reservoirs for flood control, power, and allied purposes.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of approved system of reservoirs in White River Basin to provide for power in conjunction with flood control at Greers Ferry Reservoir; addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power, and other purposes.

Estimated cost (July 1953):

	Greers Ferry	Beaver	Total
First cost (excluding recreational features).....	\$26, 986, 000	\$44, 960, 000	\$71, 946, 000

Local cooperation: None.

Project economics:

	Greers Ferry	Beaver
Annual charges.....	\$1, 162, 000	\$1, 899, 000
Annual benefits.....	1, 361, 000	1, 716, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.2	1.1

Remarks: The Beaver and Greers Ferry projects are part of the overall flood control plan for the White River and tributaries which was first authorized as part of the overall flood-control plan of the Mississippi River of 1938. After prolonged investigation, the Corps of Engineers decided to recommend 5 multiple-purpose projects as a modification of this flood-control plan; however, final review in the light of new economic criteria resulted in dropping all but 2, namely, the Beaver project and the Greers Ferry project, the latter of which is already authorized for flood control. The committee heard considerable testimony regarding the severe flood damage which affects 1 million acres of fertile land in the lower White River Basin and 30,000 people. There is considerable need for power in the basin. The projects have been supported vigorously by all those concerned, the only point raised in opposition being possible adverse aspects to a wildlife refuge near the mouth of the White River. The committee feels that these are worthwhile projects and should be authorized at this time.

The existing monetary authorization for the basin is sufficient to include any planning or construction work which may be undertaken in the near future on these two projects and need not be increased on account of these projects at this time.

ARKANSAS RIVER AT ENID, OKLA.

(H. Doc. 185, 83d Cong.)

Location: Enid, Okla., is located on Boggy Creek in north central part of the State about 65 miles north of Oklahoma City.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution January 28, 1947.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a diversion channel, levees and appurtenant structures to divert Boggy Creek flows into South Boggy Creek.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$725,000	\$295,000	\$1,020,000
Current.....	965,000	330,000	1,295,000

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way, and alterations and relocations; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; and contribute in cash toward the cost of constructing the drop structure.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$43,000	\$48,000
Annual benefits.....	50,700	60,400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.18	1.26

Remarks: The committee noted that the proposed plan of improvement will protect the city of Enid, Okla., from the frequent, damaging floods originating on Boggy Creek.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER URBAN AREAS AT ALTON, ILL.

(II. Doc. 397, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Alton, Ill., is on the left bank of the Mississippi River just above the confluence with the Missouri River.

Report authorized by: Two resolutions of House Flood Control Committee adopted September 18, 1944.

Existing project: No flood control project for Alton. The industrial and rural areas immediately downstream of Alton are protected by the Wood River Drainage and Levee District now under construction. Lock and dam No. 26 of the 9-foot navigation project is located at Alton.

Plan of recommended improvement: Floodwall and levee along river front about 3,550 feet long with appurtenant structures; storm and sanitary sewer structures including interior pumping plant.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,300,000	\$886,000	\$4,186,000
Current.....	3,350,000	900,000	4,250,000

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damage; maintain and operate after completion; construct sewer improvements for nonblocked gravity drainage including sewer modification and additions.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$159,818	\$162,075
Annual benefits.....	225,450	303,100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.41	1.87

Remarks: The committee noted that the project will provide protection from floods having a frequency of once in 200 years. It would become an integral part of the authorized project for adjacent areas which were designed for 200-year floods because of the urban and industrial development. The committee further noted that, if the plan recommended by House Document 397 were authorized, the current estimate of the cost thereof would be \$3,350,000, but that construction of these works would eliminate the necessity for a flank levee of the already authorized Wood River project. The savings through such elimination would approximate \$850,000. The effect, therefore, of this added authorization would be to increase the estimated Federal expenditure in the area concerned by \$2,500,000.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER—GUTTENBERG, IOWA, TO HAMBURG BAY, ILL.

(H. Doc. 281, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Area under consideration includes 314-mile reach of main stem of Mississippi River between Guttenberg, Iowa, and Hamburg Bay, Ill.

Report authorized by: House Flood Control Committee resolution, September 18, 1944, and Senate Commerce Committee resolution, January 15, 1944.

Existing project: Provides for improvement of 11 local drainage and levee districts, the Sny Basin; and at Sabula, Iowa; and for the diversion of Henderson River. Eight drainage districts completed, three abandoned due to acquisition of land for navigation project. One flood-control reservoir under construction, three others in approved plan.

Plan of recommended improvement: Additional construction for flood protection of 4 urban areas and 15 rural areas consisting generally of enlargement of existing levees, flood walls, and pumping plants.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$25,475,000	\$1,331,000	\$26,806,000
Current.....	31,612,300	1,522,300	33,134,600

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; and maintain and operate the improvements.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$1,058,200	\$1,230,100
Annual benefits.....	3,090,100	3,967,500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.92	3.22

Remarks: House Document 281, 83d Congress, recommends improvement projects for 4 municipal areas and 15 rural levee and drainage areas. The committee noted that one of the urban projects, the Credit Island project, was primarily of a recreational nature and considers, therefore, that authorization is not warranted at this time. It noted also that the justification for the Henderson County Drainage and Levee District No. 3 project was marginal and, therefore, does not consider approval of this part of the project warranted at present. The Federal cost with these two eliminated would be \$30,551,000.

FISH LAKE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 8, MONROE COUNTY, ILL.

(H. Doc. 396, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8 is located on the left bank of the Mississippi River about 12 miles south of St. Louis, Mo.

Report authorized by: House Flood Control Committee resolution adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project: There is no Federal project in the area under consideration. There are 440 acres of the Fish Lake District included in the Federal project for Prairie du Pont Levee and Sanitary District.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for modification of existing project for Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont Drainage and Levee Districts, Illinois, to eliminate the lower flank levee and to substitute therefor a riverfront levee and a lower flank levee along

Columbia Creek for flood protection for Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document and current.....	\$480,000	\$143,100	\$623,100

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free of damages; make all necessary alterations to the Missouri Pacific Railroad tracks and bridge over Columbia Creek; maintain and operate the project after completion.

Project economics:

	<i>Project document</i>
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization.....	\$21,970
Maintenance.....	400
Total.....	22,370
Annual benefits:	
Flood damages prevented.....	31,450
Savings in railroad alterations.....	14,100
Total.....	45,550
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.04

Remarks: The committee noted that this project would give protection to an agricultural area of approximately 2,900 acres, parts of which suffer very frequent flooding. It noted also that this project would preclude the necessity for construction of a flank levee for the Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont project and that this latter project is now in construction status. In view of these facts, the committee considered that the plan recommended by House Document 396, 83d Congress, should be authorized.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER-SNY ISLAND LEVEE DRAINAGE DISTRICT, ILL.

(H. Doc. 247, 83d Cong.)

Location: Sny Island Levee District lies along the left bank of the Mississippi River from mile 264.3 to 315.4 above mouth of Ohio River and extends back from river to bluff line an average distance of about 5 miles.

Report authorized by: Resolutions of House Flood Control Committee adopted September 18, 1944.

Existing project: Provides for prevention of flooding in Sny Bottoms and for drainage by conducting flows from several streams to the Mississippi River through 4 major diversions and other appurtenant works. Planning for project is under way.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for raising and strengthening existing levee along its present alinement including construction of a new section.

Estimated costs:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$5,952,000	\$148,000	\$6,100,000
Current.....	7,046,300	173,800	7,220,100

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; make alterations to utilities; maintain and operate.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$232,300	\$264,100
Annual benefits.....	594,300	807,100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.56	3.06

Remarks: The committee heard testimony which indicated that the presently authorized project in this area is designed to give protection against flooding from upland areas and that the project recommended by House Document 247, 83d Congress, is essential to give a satisfactory improvement of front-line levees constructed and developed in past years, partially by local interests and partially by the Federal Government. In view of the history of flooding of the area concerned and in view of the inadequacy of the present front-line levees, it is the opinion of the committee that the recommended project should be authorized.

UPPER IOWA RIVER, IOWA

(H. Doc. 375, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: The Upper Iowa River rises in southeastern Minnesota and flows 125 miles generally east to enter the flood plain of the Mississippi River about 1.5 miles south of New Albin, Iowa.

Report authorized by: House Flood Control Committee resolutions, September 18, 1944.

Existing project: There is no flood-control project in the area under consideration. Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, provides for the diversion of Dry Run into the Upper Iowa River above Decorah and for the construction of a levee system and channel straightening of the Upper Iowa River at Decorah to protect property and structures against floods. There is a 9-foot channel navigation project on the Mississippi River in this area. A snagging and clearing project on the Upper Iowa River was completed in January 1951 under authority of section 2 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937.

Plan of recommended improvement: Rectification of the existing channel from mile 4.2 to mile 0.2, and construction of a new outlet channel from mile 0.2 to a point on the Minnesota Slough opposite mile 671.5 on the Mississippi River, a distance of about 3 miles. Spoil material would be placed in levees which would give agricultural lands maximum protection from the design flows. The plan also provides for riprap protection at the railroad bridge and two highway bridges.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$917,200	\$70,000	\$987,200
Current.....	979,600	70,000	1,049,600

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate the project; and prevent encroachment which would reduce flood carrying capacity of the channel.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$53,560	\$54,920
Annual benefits.....	69,020	92,050
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.29	1.68

Remarks: The committee noted that the proposed improvement will provide protection from floods with frequency of once in 12 years for late spring floods and once in 6 years for summer floods. Improvement will reduce damages in the Mississippi River bottomlands below the railroad bridge and substantially reduce damages in the reaches upstream from the bridge, including damages to main transportation routes.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Location and description: The Missouri River is formed by the confluence of the Gallatin, Madison, and Jefferson Rivers at Three Forks, Mont., in the southwestern part of the State. It flows in a general southeasterly direction to its junction with the Mississippi River about 17 miles above St. Louis, Mo. From the headwaters of the Missouri River to its mouth, the surrounding area changes from mountainous at the headwaters to sloping terrace lands and finally to rolling plains near its mouth. The river has a total length of 2,460 miles and drains an area of about 529,350 square miles, of which 9,715 square miles are in Canada. The basin's economy is predominantly agricultural. However, manufacturing is an important occupation, consisting principally of processing crops and livestock into food products. Floods on the Missouri River occur frequently causing severe damages to municipal, residential, agricultural, and industrial properties. It has been estimated that on the major streams flood damages totaled \$68 million in the flood of 1943 and \$213 million in the flood of 1947. The great flood disaster of July 1951, in Kansas and Missouri, inflicted damages of more than \$1 billion. Records indicate that a total of 291 lives have been lost due to floods since 1935.

Existing comprehensive plan: A general plan for the Missouri River and its tributaries was prepared by the Corps of Engineers in accordance with studies made pursuant to House Document No. 308, 69th Congress. The comprehensive plan of improvement for the basin was initiated by Congress in the River and Harbor Act of 1935 which authorized the construction of the Fort Peck Dam. A number of local protection projects were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936. In the Flood Control Act of 1938, Congress approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes; and the Flood Control Act of 1944 expanded that plan to provide a coordinated plan of improvement for flood control and water conservation for the basin as a whole, known generally as the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin. It is being accomplished jointly by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. These

authorizations combine to provide a comprehensive plan for control and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin for flood protection; navigation; irrigation; water supply for industrial and domestic use; development of hydroelectric power; and other purposes. This comprehensive plan of improvement includes in addition to those projects having full monetary authorization the following elements under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers which are subject to an overall basin monetary limitation.

<i>Project</i>		
Projects completed or construction under way:		<i>Total estimated cost</i>
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans.....		\$12, 347, 500
Missouri River agricultural levees.....		151, 200, 000
Omaha, Nebr.....		5, 900, 000
Council Bluffs, Iowa.....		2, 635, 000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.....		198, 485, 000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak.....		306, 000, 000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.....		289, 854, 000
Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr.....		45, 641, 000
Indianola, Nebr.....		67, 300
Bartley, Nebr.....		120, 100
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr.....		60, 055, 000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans.....		87, 941, 000
Subtotal.....		1, 160, 245, 900
Projects remaining, construction not yet started:		
Pomme de Terre Reservoir, Mo.....		22, 446, 000
Pioneer Reservoir, Kans.....		19, 283, 000
Red Willow Reservoir, Nebr.....		12, 088, 000
Sioux City, Iowa.....		1, 183, 000
Big Bend Reservoir, S. Dak.....		68, 775, 000
Oseeola Reservoir, Mo.....		114, 018, 000
South Grand Reservoir, Mo.....		28, 727, 000
Chillicothe Reservoir, Mo.....		64, 128, 000
Arlington Reservoir, Mo.....		26, 250, 000
Richland Reservoir, Mo.....		32, 269, 000
Subtotal.....		389, 167, 000
Total.....		1, 549, 412, 900

Local cooperation: None for reservoirs; the local cooperation for the local protection works is in accordance with parts a, b, and c of section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Benefits: The comprehensive plan of development will produce many benefits throughout the basin, including prevention of flood damages; increased crop production through irrigation; much needed hydroelectric power for domestic, commercial, and industrial uses; recreational developments at reservoir areas; and regulation of river flows for navigation and municipal and industrial water supply. Many of the above benefits are reimbursable and the costs of these functions will be paid back to the Federal Government. There are also other related benefits not susceptible to monetary evaluation, including benefits accruing to the plan of improvement due to the growth of industry, business, and population. The construction and operation of the main-stem reservoirs and levee system will afford complete protection along the main stem of the Missouri River below Sioux City as well as important reductions in flood stages on the lower Mississippi River. The construction and operation of the tributary reservoirs designed primarily for flood control, together with additional reservoirs and local protection projects recommended for con-

struction by the Corps of Engineers will effect a large reduction in the frequency and magnitude of tributary overflows, providing a high degree of flood control.

Existing authorization and status: The existing project was authorized by the following flood control acts, with the amount of authorization as indicated:

Flood Control Act, June 28, 1938-----	\$9, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, Aug. 18, 1941-----	7, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, Dec. 22, 1944-----	200, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946-----	150, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, May 17, 1950-----	250, 000, 000
Total-----	616, 000, 000

Through fiscal year 1954, Congress has made available funds in the amount of \$517,033,800. The Civil Functions Appropriation bill, 1955, contains funds in the amount of \$62,400,000 for continuation of construction on projects in the comprehensive plan, making total appropriations to date of \$579,433,800. This amount subtracted from the total authorization to date, leaves a balance of available monetary authorization for future appropriations of \$36,566,200.

Additional authorization: The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers, that based upon its 6-year program for expenditures in the Missouri River Basin, sufficient authorization would not be available to cover the full appropriation in fiscal year 1956. And, in 1957, a total deficit authorization of approximately \$144 million would exist in the basin. The committee has therefore included this additional amount of authorization in the bill in order that the prosecution of the comprehensive plan might proceed in an efficient and orderly manner.

KANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, COLORADO, NEBRASKA, AND KANSAS

(H. Doc. No. 642, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Kansas River is formed near Junction City, Kans., by the confluence of the Smoky Hill and Republican Rivers and flows eastward about 169 miles to the Missouri River at Kansas City, 378.9 miles above the mouth of the latter stream. Smoky Hill River rises in the plains of eastern Colorado and flows generally eastward 562 miles to its junction with Republican River. Principal tributaries of the Smoky Hill are the Saline and Solomon Rivers which rise near the Colorado-Kansas State line, flow eastward in courses generally parallel to the main stream and enter it, 106.5 and 85.4 miles, respectively, above its mouth. Republican River headwaters rise in north-eastern Colorado, and the main stream, formed by the Arikaree and North Fork in extreme southwestern Nebraska, flows eastward and southeastward 421.7 miles across Nebraska and Kansas to its junction with Smoky Hill River. Principal tributaries to Kansas River below Junction City are Big Blue, Delaware, and Wakarusa Rivers. Kansas River and tributaries drain an area of 60,060 square miles of which 8,710 square miles are in Colorado, 16,930 square miles in Nebraska, and 34,420 square miles in Kansas.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, 1941, and 1944, in addition to several committee resolutions extending from April 2, 1936, to June 21, 1944.

Existing project: Includes the reservoirs of Harlan County, Kanopolis, Tuttle Creek, Trenton, Medicine Creek, Enders, Bonny, Cedar Bluff, Kirwin, Webster, Red Willow, Pioneer, Wray, Norton, Wilson, and Glen Elder, and local protection projects at Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.; Topeka, Kans.; Indianola, Neb.; and Bartley, Nebr.

Recommended plan of improvement: Addition of Milford and Perry Reservoirs, and local protection projects for Lawrence, Topeka, Manhattan, Abilene, Salina, Marysville, Merriam, Fort Riley, and Stonehouse Creek, all in Kansas, and Beatrice, and Hubbell in Nebraska. Since publication of the document, the Fort Riley project has been built by military forces, and the project for Stonehouse Creek has been built under the authority of section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1946)	\$41,609,530	\$1,076,800	\$42,686,330
Current (1953)	73,710,000	6,534,000	80,244,000

Local cooperation: Reservoirs, none. Local protection projects—provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate the improvements.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges	\$1,604,495	-----
Annual benefits	1,893,087	-----
Benefit-cost ratio	1.18	1.88

Remarks: The committee heard extensive testimony relative to the projects recommended by House Document 642, 81st Congress. It noted that the record flood of 1951 had occurred subsequent to the preparation of the Chief of Engineers' report as contained in that document. This flood had indicated the necessity for modification of certain of the projects recommended, particularly the local protection projects. Representatives of the Corps of Engineers indicated that extensive restudy of the basin had been undertaken since the 1951 flood and that this restudy had indicated that all projects recommended by House Document 642 were urgently needed. These representatives explained in detail the characteristics and estimated cost of the modification this restudy had shown to be warranted. In view of the extremely serious situation in the basin, and of the detailed study that has been made thereof since 1951, the committee considers that the projects recommended in House Document 642, as modified by testimony of representatives of the Chief of Engineers during hearings, should be authorized. The estimated total cost to the Federal Government of these projects, as modified, is \$73,710,000.

OSAGE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MISSOURI AND KANSAS

(H. Doc. No. 549, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Osage River rises in east-central Kansas and flows easterly and southeasterly 190 miles to the Kansas-Missouri State line, thence east in Missouri 306 miles to its junction with the Missouri River 129 miles above the Mississippi River. The Kansas portion of Osage River was designated as the Marais des Cygnes River by an act of the Kansas Legislature in 1917 and is known locally by that name. The basin includes an area of 15,300 square miles, of which 4,300 square miles are in Kansas and 11,000 square miles in Missouri.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of 1944; resolution, Committee on Flood Control, June 22, 1943.

Existing project: The existing project for flood control in the Missouri River Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, provides for three reservoirs in the Osage River Basin. These projects are the Osceola, Pomme de Terre, and South Grand Reservoirs. Construction has not been started.

Flood problem: The Osage River is subject to damaging floods which may occur at any time of the year as a result of intense rainfall. The principal flood damage area comprises 197,000 acres along the main stream and about 231,000 acres along major tributaries and includes all or part of numerous towns, roads, railroads, public utility properties, resort developments, and productive agricultural areas. Average annual flood damages in the basin over the 21-year period 1927 through 1947 have amounted to about \$1,175,000. Thirteen lives have been lost in floods during that period.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a system of nine reservoirs and local protection works at Ottawa and Osawatomie, Kans. The dam site locations, controlled drainage areas, and proposed capacities of the reservoirs are shown in the following table:

Reservoir	Location, stream	Drainage area (square miles)	Capacity (acre-feet)		
			Flood control	Conservation and sediment	Total
Pomona.....	Hundred Ten Mile Creek..	322	155,000	26,000	181,000
Melvern.....	Marais des Cygnes River (mile 442.1).	352	170,000	28,000	198,000
Garnett.....	Pottawatomie Creek.....	334	160,000	26,000	186,000
Hillsdale.....	Big Bull Creek.....	144	77,000	13,000	90,000
Fort Scott.....	Marmaton River.....	306	130,750	6,250	137,000
Hackleman Corner.....	Cedar Creek.....	415	212,300	7,700	220,000
Stockton.....	Sae River.....	1,160	774,000	226,000	1,000,000
Pomme de Terre.....	Pomme de Terre River.....	611	378,000	197,000	575,000
Kasinger Bluff.....	Osage River (mile 175).....	1 7,846	3,918,000	122,000	4,040,000
Total.....		11,490	5,975,050	651,950	6,627,000

¹ Area below upstream reservoirs.

This system of reservoirs includes a modification of the presently authorized Pomme de Terre Reservoir and would replace the presently authorized Osceola and South Grand Reservoirs. Power installations of 7,000 kilowatts each are provided for in the plans for Stockton and Pomme de Terre projects and powerplants could be installed at the remaining reservoir projects if found justifiable in the future. Planned

improvements at Ottawa and Osawatomic, Kans., provide for levee and channel works to supplement reservoir control and afford complete local protection from floods up to the maximum of record.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (September 1947).....	\$178,094,000	\$192,000	\$178,286,000
Current (July 1953).....	246,822,000	353,000	247,175,000

Local cooperation: Reservoirs, none. Local protection projects—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; pay for all building damages, make all street revisions and utility changes; hold and save United States free from damages; and maintain and operate the improvements.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$6,579,000	\$8,347,000
Annual benefits.....	7,466,300	10,320,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.13	1.24

Remarks: The Osage River Basin is subject to frequent and destructive floods. The only flood-control projects in the basin at the present time consist of improved channel work providing only a fair degree of protection for a very limited area. Consideration of the flood problems clearly demonstrates the need for comprehensive planning for flood control in the Osage River Basin, coordinated with the presently authorized system for the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. The estimated costs of the Osceola, South Grand, and Pomme de Terre Reservoirs, as approved, were \$40,000,000. Their replacement by the recommended plan will result in additional costs to the United States of \$137,694,000, based on survey report costs, and \$206,422,000 based on revised estimates.

The committee heard extensive testimony on the plan for the Osage River Basin recommended by House Document 549 of the 81st Congress. During this testimony it was indicated that certain minor modifications in the plan now appeared warranted in view of the experience gained from the record flood of 1951. The committee noted that flood control in the basin was seriously needed and that from the flood of 1951 alone damages totaled \$33 million. It noted also that projects already approved in the Osage Basin have a present estimated cost of \$165,191,000. The committee considered that the serious situation in this basin warranted earliest approval of the plan recommended by House Document 549, as modified by testimony given by Corps of Engineers representatives during the hearing, at a total estimated Federal cost of \$246,822,000, but at an increased cost over prior authorizations of \$81,631,000. The plan concerned is a modification of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of 1938 and later modified and amended. The committee considered that the monetary ceiling for appropriations for the Missouri Basin plan, available through prior acts and as provided for elsewhere in this act, is sufficient for the present.

KANSAS CITYS, KANS. AND MO.—ARMOURDALE UNIT

The present plan of the Corps of Engineers for flood protection in the lower Armourdale area of the Kansas City project provides for the protection of existing railroad tracks occupying a shelf in the high bluff area between the Armourdale unit and the downstream limit of the Fairfax-Jersey Creek unit by construction of a flood wall along the riverward edge of this shelf. The plan was selected from the several originally considered because it offered the cheapest overall means of providing the protection considered necessary for this area.

Local interests have proposed that the existing railroad tracks be raised to design flood elevation in lieu of the plan proposed by the Corps of Engineers. The committee is informed that this plan was originally considered but was not adopted because of the excessive cost and anticipated difficulty in coordinating the interests of local agencies during construction operations. Local interests now report that by undertaking their plan with their own forces they can effect certain economies so as to reduce the overall cost for such plan, exclusive of betterments, to slightly more than \$3 million. They desired that the United States participate in this plan by contributing funds in the amount of \$2,750,000, which is the estimated construction cost to the Federal Government for the improvement under the existing authorization.

The committee notes that the plan of improvement proposed by local interests will provide the necessary flood control as contemplated in the original project and will not commit the Federal Government to an expenditure beyond the amount presently authorized. Therefore, an item has been included in the bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers to contribute not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan proposed by local interests for protection in the Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project.

CHARITON RIVER, IOWA AND MO.

(H. Doc. 561, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: The Chariton River rises near Osceola in south central Iowa and flows in easterly and southeasterly directions to the Iowa-Missouri State line, then south to its confluence with the Missouri River near Glasgow, Mo. The total area of the basin is 3,080 square miles, of which 925 are in Iowa and 2,155 are in Missouri.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of 1946; House Flood Control Committee resolution, July 16, 1945.

Existing project: (a) channel improvement and levee work in Chariton County, Mo.; (b) channel improvements in Macon and Adair Counties, Mo., below Novinger; and (c) channel improvement in the vicinity of Reinhart ranch in Schuyler County, Mo.

Plan of recommended improvement: Approval of the general plan to provide for the Rathbun Reservoir on the Chariton River, about a mile north of Rathbun, Iowa, and for flood-protection works at Mystic, Iowa. The reservoir would have a storage capacity of 483,000 acre-feet, of which 327,000 acre-feet would be reserved for flood control, 134,000 acre-feet for improvement of low-water flows, and 22,000 acre-feet for sedimentation. The dam would have a crest length of 8,300 feet and height of 84 feet. The flood-control work at Mystic, Iowa,

would consist of channel improvements along Walnut and Wildeat Creeks.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Rathbun Reservoir:			
Project document (July 1947)-----	\$14, 554, 000	-----	\$14, 554, 000
Current (January 1954)-----	19, 568, 000	-----	19, 568, 000
Mystie, Iowa:			
Project document (July 1947)-----	29, 640	\$3, 360	33, 000
Current (January 1954)-----	44, 000	4, 000	48, 000

Local cooperation: Rathbun Reservoir—None. Local protection works at Mystie, Iowa—Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain the improvements.

Project economics:

	Project document		Current	
	Federal	Non-Federal	Federal	Non-Federal
Annual charges:				
Rathbun Reservoir-----	\$580, 000	-----	\$696, 000	-----
Mystie, Iowa-----	1, 510	\$480	1, 550	\$650
Annual benefits:				
Rathbun Reservoir-----	884, 000	-----	1, 047, 000	-----
Mystie, Iowa-----	2, 300	-----	2, 800	-----
Benefit-cost ratio:				
Rathbun Reservoir-----	1. 52	-----	1. 50	-----
Mystie, Iowa-----	1. 16	-----	1. 27	-----

Remarks: After study of the recommendations in House Document 561, 81st Congress, the committee concluded the project should be authorized.

LITTLE SIOUX RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, IOWA

(S. Doc. 127, 83d Cong.)

Location: A left bank tributary of the Missouri River with its confluence near the town of River Sioux, Iowa. Basin includes area of 4,550 square miles, of which 330 are in Minnesota and 4,220 are in Iowa.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, September 18, 1952.

Existing project: Provides for channel improvement and levees on Little Sioux River from the mouth to Smithland, on the lower reach of Maple River, on the Monona-Harrison ditch, on West Fork and Wolf Creek ditches, together with a desilting basin on the latter two ditches. Construction has not been started.

Plan of recommended improvement: Consists of channel enlargements, including diversion, levees, and appurtenant works, in lieu of presently authorized works.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report-----	\$15, 466, 000	\$2, 615, 000	\$18, 081, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; perform highway and utility alterations except raising highway bridges; hold and save United States free from damages; maintain and operate.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	<i>Report</i>
Federal: Interest and amortization-----	\$545, 350
Non-Federal-----	217, 500
Total-----	762, 850
Annual benefits:	
Reduction in flood damage-----	1, 043, 000
Reduction in maintenance costs on Monona-Harrison ditch-----	38, 800
Total-----	1, 081, 800
Benefit-cost ratio-----	1. 42

Remarks: The committee heard testimony as to the high frequency and great damage of flooding on the lower reaches of the Little Sioux River. It noted that there is a presently approved project for the area concerned, which would be inadequate if undertaken now, and which has a current estimated Federal cost of \$5,390,000. The estimated Federal cost of the plan recommended by the Chief of Engineers' report of April 15, 1954, is \$15,466,000. The modification concerned, therefore, would involve an increased Federal expenditure of \$10,076,000.

LITTLE MISSOURI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES AT MARMARTH, N. DAK.

(S. Doc. No. 134, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in the northeastern corner of Wyoming and flows northeast across the southeastern corner of Montana and into the northwestern corner of South Dakota, thence generally northerly into North Dakota and to its junction with Missouri River in the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. Marmarth is located on Little Missouri River at river mile 306.4 and occupies a pocketlike basin of low bottom land within a bend of the river. Marmarth is a freight-division point on the Milwaukee Railroad, which is the principal support of the town.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, adopted October 25, 1937.

Existing project: The existing levee system was partially constructed in 1908 by the Milwaukee Railroad and was extended by Federal agencies in cooperation with local interests in 1939 and 1940. The existing project for flood control at Marmarth, N. Dak., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, provides for protection of the town by means of a levee. The project has not been constructed as local interests indicated in 1937 that they could not furnish the required cooperation.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of a levee beginning near the westerly edge of town at the South approach grade of United States Highway No. 12 to the overpass at the Milwaukee Railroad and generally following the alinement of the existing levee, with certain minor deviations, around the westerly, southerly, and easterly edge of the town for a distance of 8,100 feet to the west approach grade of the Milwaukee Railroad bridge over Little Missouri River;

thence continuing northward as a new levee from the opposite side of the approach grade, 2,350 feet to high ground for protection of the Browning addition.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1948).....	\$171,200	\$3,200	\$174,400
Current (June 1953).....	212,300	4,000	216,300

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; remove buildings as necessary, relocate utilities, raise the county highway grade as required at its intersection with the levee, and make all other road and street revisions or relocations as required; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate all the works after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges: Interest, amortization, and maintenance.....	\$6,890	\$7,850
Annual benefits: Flood damage prevented.....	11,100	13,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.6	1.66

Remarks: After study of the recommendations in Senate Document 134, 81st Congress, the committee concluded the project should be authorized.

COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENN.

(H. Doc. 154, 82d Cong.)

Location: Rises in northern Anderson County and flows 12 miles to join Clinch River about 5 miles below Norris Dam. Lake City, a community of about 1,520 in 1950, is the principal damage center.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Flood protection by means of channel work consisting of enlargement and rectification to obtain a bottom width of 100 feet together with a cutoff having a bottom width of 20 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1949).....	\$660,000	\$81,000	\$741,000
Current (July 1953).....	745,200	109,300	854,500

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; make necessary bridge and utility changes; and prevent encroachment.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$29, 100	\$30, 100
Maintenance.....	5, 000	6, 100
Other.....	700	
Total.....	34, 800	36, 200
Annual benefits: Flood damages prevented.....	43, 300	54, 800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 24	1. 51

Remarks: After study of the recommendations in House Document 154, 82d Congress, the committee concluded the project should be authorized.

SANDY LICK CREEK AT AND IN THE VICINITY OF REYNOLDSVILLE, PA.

(H. Doc. 716, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Rises in the Allegheny Mountains in Clearfield County and flows 20 miles westerly to Reynoldsville, thence 10 miles to Red-bank Creek, a tributary of the Allegheny River. The borough of Reynoldsville is the third largest community in Jefferson County and had a population of 3,675 in 1940.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act, June 22, 1936.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel improvement and appurtenant works in Sandy Lick Creek. The improvement would consist of deepening, widening, and streamlining the channel through Reynoldsville, Pa.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (1950).....	¹ \$439, 000	\$16, 000	\$455, 000
Current.....	570, 000	21, 000	591, 000

¹ Revised to \$483,000 in Chief of Engineers report.

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas; bear the cost of all highway and street adjustments and utility alterations; hold and save the United States free from damage; maintain and operate all the works; and prevent encroachment upon the project works after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$17, 800	\$20, 800
Maintenance.....	3, 500	4, 400
Total.....	21, 300	25, 200
Annual benefits.....	25, 800	32, 800
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 21	1. 30

Remarks: As a result of a study of the report on this project, and of the testimony given in hearings, the committee concluded that the project should be authorized.

PAINT ROCK RIVER, ALA.

(Chief of Engineer's report, June 23, 1954)

Location: Paint Rock River, formed by Estill and Hurricane Forks in Jackson County, Ala., flows south 60 miles to the Tennessee River 5.8 miles below Guntersville Dam. Lower 8 miles are in the minimum flat pool of Wheeler Reservoir. Basin contains 458 square miles in northeastern Alabama and a small area in south central Tennessee. Topography is rolling to mountainous, except for relatively flat flood plains along river and principal tributaries. Stream channel has widths up to 100 feet, banks 12 to 16 feet high, and average slope of 1 to 3 feet per mile. Channel is well-defined, but in relatively poor condition, being clogged in places with logs, bars, and debris.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, March 12, 1949.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Clearing main stream of snags and obstructions, cutting the timber along banks, and excavating the channel at critical points, combined with a drainage system to be constructed by local interests. The plan provides for clearing and straightening the channel of Paint Rock River for about 53 miles, from about mile 7 to junction of Hurricane and Estill Forks, and for similar work along the lower 4.8 miles of Little Paint Creek, the lower 1.8 miles of Guess Creek, the lower 2.1 miles of Hurricane Fork, the lower 2.5 miles of Larkin Fork, and the lower 3 miles of Estill Fork. The channel improvements would afford an outlet for the contemplated local drainage works, without aggravating flood conditions on the main stream.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (January 1953).....	\$540,400	\$2,062,800	\$2,603,200
Current (fall 1953).....	562,000	2,145,300	2,707,300
Subcommittee recommendation.....	1,001,300	1,606,000	2,707,300

Local cooperation: Assurances to: (a) contribute an amount equal to the Federal construction cost, presently estimated at \$562,000 by (1) furnishing all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary, (2) making any necessary road, bridge, or utility alterations required, and (3) paying the balance in cash or equivalent construction work; (b) hold and save; (c) maintain and operate; and (d) construct and maintain local drainage works.

Project economics:

	Report	Current	Subcommittee recommenda- tion
Annual charges:			
Federal: Interest and amortization.....	\$19,000	\$20,000	\$35,000
Non-Federal:			
Interest and amortization.....	73,000	76,000	61,000
Maintenance and operation.....	81,000	84,000	84,000
Total.....	173,000	180,000	180,000
Annual benefits: Including net returns on agricultural lands.....	483,000	483,000	483,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.8	2.7	2.7

Remarks: The committee noted that the plan recommended embraced certain work to be constructed by local interests, as well as certain recommended improvement of major channels to be accomplished jointly by local interests and the Federal Government. After hearing the testimony on the project, it was the opinion of the committee that the improvement of major channels should be accomplished in its entirety by the Federal Government and at a present estimated construction cost of \$1,001,300.

KALAMAZOO RIVER AT BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

(S. Doc. 98, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Battle Creek, Mich., is located on both banks of the Kalamazoo River about 108 miles upstream of the mouth of the river which empties into Lake Michigan.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, June 24, 1947.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Improvement of Kalamazoo River and its tributary, Battle Creek, for flood control at and in the vicinity of Battle Creek, Mich., by a cutoff in Kalamazoo River and channel rectification measures on both streams.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,365,000	\$2,267,000	\$5,632,000
Current.....	4,201,550	¹ 3,006,450	7,208,000

¹ Includes local cash contribution of \$105,500.

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate; prevent encroachments; construct new highway bridges; make changes and additions to streets and utilities; and contribute \$105,500 in cash (based on October 1953 prices) toward the cost of construction.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$269,600	\$290,200
Annual benefits.....	329,400	398,500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.22	1.37

Remarks: The proposed improvements would eliminate about 84 percent of flood damages at Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinity, by providing complete protection against floods 50 percent greater than those of record. The committee took note of the fact that the Secretary of the Army's letter contained in Senate Document 98, 83d Congress, proposed that local interests be required to make a cash contribution to this project in addition to fulfilling the other elements of cooperation recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The committee agreed that a cash contribution in the amount recommended by the Secretary of the Army should be required. In view of the serious flood threat existent in the area concerned, and of the past record of flooding, the committee concluded that the project should be authorized.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ILLINOIS AND INDIANA

(H. Doc. 153, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Rises in the northwestern part of La Porte County, about 6 miles south of Michigan City, Ind., and flows generally westerly about 56 miles to its junction with the Calumet-Sag Channel at Calumet Park, Ill.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act, August 18, 1941.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Enlargement of Calumet Union Drainage Ditch and connections to provide adequate drainage outlet to Little Calumet River.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$434,300	\$715,500	\$1,149,800
Current.....	509,900	1,036,500	1,546,400

Local cooperation: Make all necessary modifications to highways and foot bridges, and relocate all utilities as required; provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil disposal areas; hold and save the United States free from damages; establish and enforce regulations designed to prevent encroachments on the improved channel; and maintain and operate all the works after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$48,200	\$55,200
Maintenance.....	11,500	15,500
Other charge.....	600	700
Total.....	60,300	71,400
Annual benefits: Flood damages prevented.....	99,900	128,900
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.66	1.81

Remarks: The committee noted that the population of the basin is about 202,000, predominately urban. Economic development of the watershed is closely interwoven with that of the somewhat larger area which has become a great industrial center known as the Calumet

region, embracing all the territory along the Lake Michigan shore from South Chicago to Michigan City. Damage surveys following the April 1947 and March 1948 floods indicated that damages in the area of the Calumet union drainage system amounted to \$977,400 and \$139,200 respectively.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

Location: The Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and Ballona Creek drain an area of 1,717 square miles in southwestern California. The Los Angeles River is formed by the junction of Calabasas and Bell Creeks near the Los Angeles-Ventura County line, flows southeast 20 miles along the south side of the San Fernando Valley, then turns and flows south for 30 miles and discharges into the Pacific Ocean through a diversion channel in the city of Long Beach.

Floods and flood damages: The streams in the Los Angeles River drainage basin are subject to sudden and destructive floods resulting from rapid runoff from mountainous areas. The Los Angeles area has experienced a flood on an average of once every 4 years and a disastrous storm once in 10 years. In the 2 years, 1934 and 1938, heavy floods took a toll of more than 100 lives and destroyed property valued in excess of \$100 million.

Existing project: A comprehensive plan of improvement for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basins was initiated by Congress in the first general Flood Control Act of 1936 which authorized the construction of a number of local flood-protection works originally initiated under provisions of the Emergency Relief Acts of 1935 and 1936 and were transferred to the project "Los Angeles County drainage area, California" on June 30, 1937, for completion. The Flood Control Act of 1941, adopted the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River Basins, as set forth in House Document 838, 76th Congress. The plan provides for protection of Los Angeles County areas by control of the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, the Rio Hondo, and Ballona Creek, to be effected by construction of flood-control reservoirs, debris basins, and channel improvements for safe conveyance of river flows. The present estimated cost to the United States for this plan is \$363,265,500, of which \$36,380,100, is for the Whittier Narrows Reservoir.

Local cooperation: The improvements are authorized subject to the provision that in each case, except for the units authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1936, responsible local agencies give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the work, including construction at their own expense or contributing to the cost of construction of all highway and highway bridge modifications needed in connection with the project; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages resulting from the construction of the works, and (c) maintain and operate all the works, with the exception of the dams, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

Benefits: With this project in operation, the probable overflow areas of 325,000 acres in Los Angeles County which, in the past, have been subject to flooding by these streams, will be relieved of the flood

hazard. Included in the flood plain are areas in Los Angeles, Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Long Beach, and many other cities of this densely populated southern California region, and thousands of acres of valuable citrus groves. It has been estimated that the completed portions of the project have already prevented flood damages in excess of \$40 million, and in the event of the occurrence, after completion, of a "project design flood" damages in excess of \$100 million would be prevented.

Present authorization and status: Monetary authorization in the amount of \$197,541,000 has been made available by the Congress as follows:

Flood Control Act, 1936.....	\$70, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1938.....	12, 541, 000
Flood Control Act, 1941.....	25, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1944.....	25, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1946.....	25, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1950.....	40, 000, 000
Total.....	197, 541, 000

Funds totaling \$147,793,400 have been appropriated through fiscal year 1954, leaving a balance of available authorization of \$49,747,600. At the time the committee considered additional authorization for this basin, the civil functions bill for 1955, as passed by the House, included construction funds in the amount of \$12 million, of which \$3,500,000 was for the Whittier Narrows Reservoir, making total appropriations to date of \$159,793,400. This amount, when subtracted from the present available monetary authorization, leaves a balance of \$37,747,600, for future appropriations.

Additional authorization: The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers, that based upon an appropriation schedule designed to permit economical and orderly progress on continuation of needed flood control and related works in the Los Angeles River Basin, it is estimated that an amount of approximately \$50 million will be required during fiscal years 1956 and 1957. This amount is about \$12,500,000 in excess of the available authorization. The committee therefore recommends that the monetary authorization for the Los Angeles River Basin be increased by \$12,500,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

MIDDLE CREEK, LAKE COUNTY, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 367, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Middle Creek is a tributary of Clear Lake in the Cache Creek Basin in Lake County, Calif. Scott and Clover Creeks join Middle Creek just below the town of Upper Lake. Cache Creek is a tributary of the Sacramento River.

Plan of recommended improvement: Would consist of enlargement of existing levees and the construction of additional levees along Middle Creek for a total distance of about 5 miles, a levee on the left bank of Scott Creek from its mouth upstream for a distance of about 1 mile, and a diversion channel from Clover Creek to Middle Creek above the town of Upper Lake.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Current 1st cost.....	\$1, 110, 000	\$790, 000	\$1, 900, 000

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and make necessary relocations and alterations to existing utilities; hold and save United States free from damage; and maintain and operate improvements after completion.

Remarks: The committee heard testimony indicating that the area concerned suffered from very frequent and damaging floods and that the proposed improvement has benefits substantially in excess of costs.

AMERICAN RIVER LEVEE, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 367, 81st Cong.)

Location: The Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin, Calif., with a length of about 500 miles and an average width of 120 miles, drains an area of approximately 59,000 square miles. The Sacramento River, with a drainage area of approximately 26,300 square miles in the northern part of the basin, rises in the Trinity Mountains and flows about 375 miles in a southerly direction to empty into Suisun Bay near Collinsville. The American River is one of its important tributaries. It drains an area about 1,918 square miles.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938.

Flood problem: Extensive housing developments along the American River in the environs of and in the suburban area immediately east of Sacramento, have necessitated a reconsideration of the adequacy of the degree of protection that would be provided in such areas upon completion of Folsom Reservoir. It has been concluded that the present project levees should be extended upstream to supplement the protection which would be provided by Folsom Reservoir in order to fully utilize the present leveed channel capacity of the American River in the vicinity of Sacramento without creating an unsafe flood hazard in the newly developed areas upstream therefrom.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for raising and extending the existing levees in the vicinity of Sacramento for about 7 miles along the right (north) bank of the American River, from the existing levee to high ground above the overflow area. The proposed levees will have an average height of about 22 feet and provide a 5-foot free-board above the maximum flow line with Folsom Reservoir in operation.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$900, 000	\$300, 000	\$1, 200, 000
Current.....	1, 600, 000	500, 000	2, 100, 000

Local cooperation: Provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, hold and save United States free from damages, and maintain and operate after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$60,000	\$90,000
Annual benefits.....		165,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....		1.83

Remarks: The committee deemed the proposed extension of levees upstream along the American River to be warranted.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

Location and description: The San Joaquin River rises in the Sierra Nevada, flows southwest through the mountains and foothills to the vicinity of Friant, Calif., where it enters the flat alluvial valley through which it flows 60 miles to Mendota, at which point the stream turns northwest and flows 157 miles to Mossdale at the head of the San Joaquin Delta, through which the river flows to join the Sacramento River at the head of Suisun Bay near Pittsburg. The river drains an area of about 17,000 square miles. Its principal tributaries, two of which are the Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, flow in a generally westerly direction through the mountains and foothills to join the main river in its lower reaches. Agriculture and allied activities are the basis for the economy of the area. Floods occur frequently in the basin. Since 1900 the San Joaquin Valley has suffered 40 damaging floods. Flood damages in 1937-38 were estimated to be \$5,340,000, in 1950-51 at \$9,340,000, and the 1952 damages were estimated in excess of \$2 million.

Existing comprehensive plan: The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized a plan for flood control and other purposes in the San Joaquin River Basin. The plan provides for levee and channel improvement and bank protection along the lower San Joaquin River from the mouth of the Merced River to the upper San Joaquin Delta; flood control storage on the Stanislaus River at the New Melones site; flood control storage on the Tuolumne River by local interests with participation by the United States; and flowage easements to preserve natural overflow lands to be provided by the State of California. The program of development on the Tuolumne River involves a cooperative arrangement between the Federal Government and local Tuolumne River interests, comprising the city and county of San Francisco and the Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts. Under the initial phase of this arrangement, local interests are constructing Cherry Valley Reservoir with financial assistance from the Federal Government and, in return, will operate the reservoir in conjunction with their Lake Eleanor, Hetch Hetchy, and existing Don Pedro Reservoirs to obtain flood control as agreed with the Secretary of the Army. Under the final phase of the program, local interests will construct New Don Pedro Reservoir, scheduled for completion in 1964, with further financial assistance on the part of the Federal Government, and will operate 340,000 acre-feet of storage in the reservoir for flood control as prescribed.

Project and status:

	Estimated cost
Projects under construction: Cherry Valley Reservoir and Tuolumne River storage, Calif.....	¹ \$12, 000, 000
Projects not started: Levee and channel improvements	5, 598, 000
New Melones Reservoir, Calif.....	51, 153, 000
Total.....	56, 751, 000

¹ Cherry Valley Reservoir is under construction by local interests (city and county of San Francisco and irrigation districts) with Federal participation for flood control to the extent of \$9 million.

Local cooperation: In the Stanislaus River Basin a responsible local agency will be required to pay for conservation storage when used. In the Tuolumne River Basin local interests are to construct, maintain, and operate dams and reservoirs. The local cooperation for the local protection works is in accordance with parts a, b, and c, of section 3, Flood Control Act of 1936, and furnish rights to overflow certain lands along the main San Joaquin River.

Benefits: The improvements proposed for the Tuolumne River Basin when completed will control practically all floods on that stream and will provide protection for about 10,000 acres of agricultural land along the Tuolumne River. On the Stanislaus River the floods are presently uncontrolled and when synchronized with floods on the San Joaquin, channel capacities are exceeded and levees along the San Joaquin between the mouth of the Stanislaus and the head of San Joaquin Delta are breached causing severe damage and large losses. The New Melones Reservoir will afford protection to about 15,000 acres of land along the Stanislaus River. The levees and channel improvements along the San Joaquin River downstream from the mouth of the Merced River supplemented by the Reservoirs will afford protection to about 140,000 acres of agricultural land.

Present authorization and status: Monetary authorization in the amount of \$10,500,000 has been provided by Congress as follows:

Flood Control Act of 1944.....	\$8, 000, 000
Act of Aug. 8, 1953.....	2, 500, 000
Total.....	10, 500, 000

Funds in the amount of \$7,891,300 have been appropriated through fiscal year 1954, leaving a balance of available authorization of \$2,608,700. The civil functions bill for 1955, as passed by the Senate, included funds in the amount of \$1,040,000 for the San Joaquin Basin, making total appropriations to date of \$8,931,300. This amount, when subtracted from the present monetary authorization, leaves a balance of \$1,568,700 for future appropriations.

Additional authorization: The committee notes that the available authorization is being used to cover appropriation of funds for the Cherry Valley Reservoir and that sufficient authorization will not be available to cover appropriations for the San Joaquin River levees, presently estimated to cost \$5,598,000. The committee was informed of the desirability of starting construction at an early date provided funds for that purpose are made available. Therefore, the committee feels that sufficient monetary authorization should be available to cover such appropriations, in order that no delay will be experienced in providing early provision of flood control in the basin, and accordingly has included an amount of \$5 million in the bill.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

Location and description: The Columbia River has its source in Columbia Lake in the Rocky Mountains of Canada and flows a distance of 462 miles in British Columbia, Canada, before crossing the international boundary into the northeast corner of the State of Washington. In the United States the river flows generally south through the central part of Washington to a junction with the Snake River, then turns and flows westerly and northwesterly to the Pacific Ocean, a total distance of 1,207 miles from its source in Columbia Lake. The most important natural resources of the Columbia River Basin are its agricultural land, forests, mineral deposits, fish, and water supply. In direct relation to these resources, the most important industries are agriculture, lumbering, and mining, with manufacturing and fishing of lesser importance. The economy of the basin depends heavily upon use of its water resources for hydroelectric power for manufacturing, mining, transportation, agricultural, and domestic uses, and for irrigation of almost 4 million acres of agricultural land. Floods of damaging proportions occur annually in one part or another of the basin. Major floods of record having basinwide significance occurred in 1876, 1894, and 1948. The flood of June 1894, the largest of general occurrence in the Columbia River Basin, caused considerable damage on most of the tributaries and on the upper and lower reaches of the main stem of the Columbia River. The 1948 flood inundated 582,000 acres of land, including the towns of Bonners Ferry, Idaho, and Woodland, Wash. Many other urban areas were under water, and Vanport, Oreg., which had a population of 18,000, was completely destroyed. Flood damages due to the 1948 flood have been estimated in excess of \$100 million, and 38 persons lost their lives.

Existing comprehensive plan: Congress, in the Flood Control Act of 1938, authorized the comprehensive improvement of the Willamette River Basin in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. In subsequent acts of Congress the comprehensive plan has been modified to provide for additional projects and increases in the monetary authorization. The 1950 Flood Control Act authorized the construction of certain projects in the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document 531, 81st Congress. The comprehensive plan of improvement includes in addition to those projects having full monetary authorization, the following elements under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, which are subject to an overall basin monetary limitation.

Projects completed or construction under way:	Total estimated cost
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg.....	\$13, 517, 100
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg.....	63, 711, 200
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg.....	90, 769, 800
Willamette River bank protection, Oreg.....	10, 701, 600
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg.....	2, 373, 300
Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oreg.....	4, 495, 800
The Dalles Reservoir, Oreg.....	348, 372, 000
Subtotal.....	533, 940, 800
maining projects, construction not yet started:	
Cougar Reservoir, Oreg.....	39, 781, 000
Blue River Reservoir, Oreg.....	13, 674, 000
Gate Creek Reservoir, Oreg.....	13, 724, 000
Cascadia Reservoir, Oreg.....	25, 126, 000
Wiley Creek Reservoir, Oreg.....	8, 069, 000
Green Peter Reservoir, Oreg.....	37, 030, 000
Johnson Creek, Oreg.....	519, 000
Portland, Oreg.....	18, 806, 000
Hills Creek Reservoir, Oreg.....	32, 261, 000
Waldo Lake tunnel, Oreg.....	922, 000
Fall Creek Reservoir, Oreg.....	18, 779, 000
Holly Reservoir, Oreg.....	12, 405, 000
Willamette Falls fish ladder, Oreg.....	206, 000
Willamette River snagging and clearing, Oreg.....	2, 101, 000
Libby Reservoir, Mont.....	290, 796, 000
Priest Rapids Reservoir, Wash.....	364, 270, 000
John Day Reservoir, Oreg.....	461, 031, 000
Pendleton, Oreg.....	607, 000
Jackson Hole, Wyo.....	1, 915, 000
Columbia River local protection.....	15, 000, 000
Willamette River Basin channel improvement and major drainage, Oregon.....	14, 804, 000
Subtotal.....	1, 371, 826, 000
Total.....	1, 905, 766, 800

Local cooperation: None for reservoirs; the local cooperation for the local protection works is in accordance with parts a, b, and c of section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Benefits: The comprehensive plan of development for the Columbia River Basin will produce numerous benefits throughout the area. The main control plan, including such reservoirs as The Dalles, which is under construction, together with the levees, floodwalls, and bank protection projects, will reduce flood damages in the lower basin by more than 90 percent. The plan of improvement, in addition to controlling floods on the lower Columbia River, will also provide effective control on the Willamette, Kootenai, and Snake Rivers, and maximum protection economically feasible on other tributaries. The projects of the plan will also permit full development and extend inland navigation on the Columbia, Snake, and Willamette Rivers. In addition, the multiple-purpose reservoirs will greatly increase the presently available power capacity of the Federal projects in the basin. Other benefits accruing to the plan of improvement are those resulting from the irrigation of arid lands, pollution abatement, domestic and industrial water supplies, and recreation. Many benefits are not subject to monetary evaluation but nevertheless are very realistic, these include prevention of loss of life, improved standards of living, and stabilization of business and employment.

Existing authorization and status: The existing project was authorized by the following flood control acts, with the amount of authorization as indicated:

Flood Control Act, 1938.....	\$11, 300, 000
Flood Control Act, 1941.....	11, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1944	20, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1946.....	35, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1950.....	115, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1953.....	75, 000, 000
Flood Control Act, 1954.....	16, 000, 000
Total.....	283, 300, 000

Funds for prosecution of the comprehensive plan in the amount of \$232,991,600 have been made available by the Congress through fiscal year 1954. At the time the committee gave consideration to increasing the monetary authorization for this basin, the civil functions bill as passed by the Senate included funds for the basin in the amount of \$42,085,000, making total appropriations to date of \$275,076,600. This amount, when subtracted from the present available monetary authorization, leaves a balance of \$8,223,400.

Additional authorization: The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers, that based upon an appropriation schedule designed to permit economical and orderly progress on continuation of needed flood control and related works in the Columbia River Basin, it is estimated that an amount of approximately \$75 million will be required during fiscal year 1956, and an amount of approximately \$115 million will be required during fiscal year 1957. These amounts are about \$180 million in excess of the available monetary authorization. The committee has therefore included authorization in the bill in the amount of \$180 million for continuation of the comprehensive plan.

The Cougar and Green Peter projects, currently authorized as flood-control projects, were planned and recommended by the Corps of Engineers as multiple-purpose projects in the interests of hydroelectric power, as well as flood control and other purposes, in the comprehensive plan for the Columbia Basin, published as House Document 531, 81st Congress, 2d session. There appears to be no question as to the economic desirability of including power as a project purpose, since in each case it can be combined with flood control to the advantage of both, and ample testimony has been presented concerning the great need for additional power in this and other parts of the Columbia Basin.

Proposals have been made for construction of each of these projects by means of a partnership arrangement between Federal and non-Federal interests, and in the case of the Cougar project a bill to authorize such an arrangement has been passed by the House. However, it is not known whether such a bill will be enacted into law. It is desirable that the authorized plan for the development of this and other projects should represent the most desirable employment of the water resources of the region, and planning should proceed on that basis regardless of the decision that may be arrived at as to the agency which should construct the project or portions thereof. It is considered, therefore, that the comprehensive plan should be modified to authorize the construction of power at these projects, including the provision

of the White Bridge regulating dam downstream from the Green Peter project.

The existing monetary authorization for the Columbia Basin, as modified by this bill, will be sufficient to cover any planning or construction of these projects which may be undertaken in the near future, and need not be increased on account of these projects at this time.

GOLD CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, ALASKA

(H. Doc. No. 54, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: The Gold Creek drainage basin is located on the mainland of southeastern Alaska near the city of Juneau. Gold Creek originates in the coastal mountains approximately 4 miles east of Juneau. It flows northwestward for about 2 miles, thence southwestward for about 3 miles, passing through the western section of the city of Juneau to empty into Gastineau Channel. The principal tributaries are Granite Creek, Lurvey Creek, and Icy Gulch Creek.

Report authorized by: Section 11 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project for Gold Creek, Alaska. However, various improvements have been accomplished under emergency authority available to the Corps of Engineers and by the WPA.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for a channel with the bottom paved with derrickstone 2 feet thick and the sides paved with concrete 10 inches thick. This improvement would extend for a distance of 1,717 feet through the city of Juneau, designed to carry the standard project flood of 4,800 cubic feet per second.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$311,000	\$20,000	\$331,000
Current (September 1953).....	380,000	25,600	405,600

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold the United States free from any damages resulting from construction of the project; contribute the cost of making necessary alterations to bridges and utilities and constructing the necessary fence; and maintain the entire project after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$14,900	\$10,300
Annual benefits.....	\$38,700	\$34,400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.59	3.32

Remarks: Testimony during the hearings on this project indicated that recent developments had shown certain modifications of the project, as recommended by House Document 54 of the 83d Congress, to be necessary and that the current estimated cost to the Federal

Government of all work concerned, with these modifications, is \$380,000. The committee agrees with the necessity for this work with such modification as recent developments have shown to be necessary.

WAILOA STREAM AND ITS TRIBUTARIES, ISLAND OF HAWAII, T. H.

(H. Doc. No. 529, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Location: Wailoa Stream, known locally as Wailoa River, is entirely within the bounds of the city of Hilo on the northeastern side of the island of Hawaii. It extends northeasterly about 0.6 mile from the north end of Waiakca Pond to Hilo Bay.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of 1939.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of a diversion and channel to combine the flows of Kawili Stream with those of Waiakea Stream above the city of Hilo; improvement of the present Waiakea Channel embankments to contain the combined flows within the channel at certain low points between the point of diversion and the residential area; and construction of a new channel outlet for Waiakea Stream from the sinkholes to Waiakea Pond, together with other appurtenant works.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$270,000	\$108,000	\$378,000
Current (October 1953).....	347,000	138,500	485,500

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; construct all necessary culverts, bridges, street revisions, and utility relocations; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate all the works after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$15,600	\$18,800
Annual benefits.....	17,600	22,600
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.13	1.2

Remarks: The committee noted that the area to be protected by the project is subject to frequent and heavy flooding induced by extraordinarily heavy rainfall in the mountains above. It concluded that the project should be authorized.

SECTION 204

Section 204. The committee has considered a small number of preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and related purposes and believes that the Corps of Engineers should be authorized to make investigations of the areas. With respect to the preliminary examination and survey of Juniata River at Lewistown and other

points in Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control, the term "and other points in Pennsylvania" refers to Everett, Huntington, Mount Union, and Smithfield Townships.

SECTION 205

Section 205. The Secretary of Agriculture, with the concurrence of the Director of the Budget, requested the Committee on Public Works to give consideration to increased monetary authorizations amounting to \$121 million for the Department of Agriculture to complete works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention on 11 watersheds authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. As a result of conferences between the Secretary of Agriculture and the chairman, it was agreed that \$20 million would be sufficient to continue the work for the next 2 years. The committee concurred in this conclusion. The watersheds involved include the following: Los Angeles River Basin; Santa Ynez River watershed, California; Trinity River Basin, Tex.; Little Tallahatchee River watershed; Yazoo River watershed; Coosa River watershed above Rome, Ga.; Little Sioux River watershed, Iowa; Potomac River watershed; Buffalo Creek watershed, New York; Colorado River watershed, Colorado; Washita River watershed.

Section 206 provides for the extension of the 75 percent rental provision from reservoir lands to include reservoirs for navigation and other purposes.

Under present law the provision of returning to the counties 75 percent of the rent of leased reservoir lands applies only to flood-control reservoirs, including multiple-purpose reservoirs containing flood-control storage. There is no reason why this provision should not be extended to include all navigation reservoirs and multiple-purpose reservoirs containing navigation provisions. This section is designed to accomplish this. The only change from existing legislation is the application of the basic provision to reservoirs including navigation.

SECTION 207

Section 207 relates to the removal of limitation on transfer of funds to Weather Bureau.

Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 as now written sets an annual limit of \$375,000 on transfers which the Chief of Engineers is authorized to make to the Weather Bureau for providing basic hydrologic and climatic information. This basic data is essential to the sound and economical planning of civil works improvements. The limiting amount of \$375,000 was adequate in 1938 when the flood-control program was being started. This limit, however, now imposes a serious restriction on the gathering of these data and adversely affects the work of the Corps of Engineers in carrying out the civil-works program. The monetary ceiling should be eliminated so that the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau can determine the annual amounts needed. In addition to raising the monetary ceiling the proposed legislation clarifies the language in the existing law which refers to "a current information service on precipitation, flood forecasts, and flood warnings." The proposed legislation substitutes for this phrase the phrase: "a network of recording and non-

recording precipitation stations, known as the hydroclimatic network." Funds available in the past have been actually used for this purpose under an administrative determination, and the change in language is designed to identify positively what program is involved.

SECTION 208

Section 208 increases the monetary limitations for clearing and snagging of streams for flood control.

At the present time due to the rise in construction costs, it is no longer possible to provide under the snagging and clearing authority work to the same degree of effectiveness as contemplated at the time of last revising the legislation in the 1946 Flood Control Act. Since that time, construction prices have approximately doubled and for that reason it is most urgent that the existing cost limitation of \$50,000 for any 1 tributary be increased to \$100,000.

Appropriations under this authority are presently limited to \$1 million a year. It is considered necessary, should the proposed project limitation be increased to \$100,000, that an increase also be allowed in the appropriation limitation for each fiscal year. That is, it is considered desirable that the appropriation limitation for a fiscal year be increased from \$1 million to \$2 million so as to permit the appropriation of additional money which would be necessary for the increased scope of work under this program, which can be expected to result from increasing the project limitation to \$100,000. This would permit accomplishment of essentially the same amount of work as contemplated under the 1946 authorization. Even though there may be no immediate prospect of larger expenditures than \$1 million the authorization should be provided especially to permit necessary flexibility in the event of an expanded public works program.

The following tabulation shows the Engineering News-Record construction cost index for 1946 and 1954 and the annual appropriations for clearing and snagging since 1948.

Pertinent data on construction cost index and appropriations for snagging and clearing work

ENR Index:	
Average for 1946.....	345
July 1954 (estimated).....	625
Appropriations:	
1948.....	\$1, 000, 000
1949.....	1, 000, 000
1950.....	1, 000, 000
1951.....	800, 000
1952.....	800, 000
1953.....	800, 000
1954.....	¹ 425, 000
1955.....	^{1 2} 600, 000

¹ All funds for fiscal year 1954 allotted and essentially all of fiscal year 1955 amount has already been earmarked based on requests received to date in fiscal year 1954.

² Amount shown represents allowance for snagging and clearing in fiscal year 1955 bill as passed by House and Senate.

SECTION 209

Section 209 provides for the establishment of additional supergrades in civil-works activities under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers.

The important and complex responsibilities assigned to the Corps of Engineers require a highly trained civilian work force headed by top-grade engineers with high professional and technical qualifications. The lack of an adequate number of supergrade spaces is at present a serious handicap in maintaining an effective work force. Government salaries in the professional field of engineering at this top level must be made more competitive with those offered by private industry in order to provide for proper staffing at all levels. The ceiling on adequate salaries for the top executive and engineering positions has a deleterious effect on the great body of civilian personnel in civil-works activities. The civil-works program, involving many hundreds of millions dollars annually, is carried out, and this technical force is maintained, with an allowance of only 2 supergrade positions (1 GS-16 and 1 GS-17). The need for additional positions in these grades is urgent to eliminate compression of grades, establish desirable career patterns, increase employee morale, and provide for recognition and retention of many highly responsible professional and technical personnel in the face of a serious national shortage of engineers and scientists. The existence of a top-grade group of specialists in a large engineering and construction organization such as the Corps of Engineers, is an invaluable asset to the country in time of national emergency. Analysis of the situation in other agencies and bureaus with similar responsibilities indicates that the Corps of Engineers should receive further recognition insofar as supergrade positions are concerned. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation, which has a considerably less workload than the Corps of Engineers civil-works activities alone, and with its work limited to 17 States and not approximating the complexity of the Corps' civil works on all the States and possessions, has 4 supergrade positions as against only 2 supergrade positions for the Corps of Engineers' civil activities.

The United States Geological Survey has two supergrade positions with an amount available for obligation in the fiscal year 1954 of only \$27,750,000 against the corps' civil-functions appropriation of \$420 million, a ratio of 1 to 1 for the supergrade positions and about 15 to 1 for the volume and complexity of the workload. The civil-works appropriations are less than a true measure of the discrepancy since some of the positions for which supergrades are desired combine both military and civil engineering functions, particularly in the field, and a proper measure of the workload would be to add the volume of military engineering and construction under the jurisdiction of top civilian engineers in the corps of Engineers' division offices who are responsible for the military engineering functions as well as the civil. The civil engineers in the corps are among the most competent in their specialties in this country and many are recognized internationally. The discrepancy as it now exists between the allotment of supergrades to the corps and comparable allotments to other parts of the Government is extremely great and has created a very serious situation. Not the least of the effects is the loss of top grade career specialists to private industry, of which one example has occurred as recently as June 1954. The Secretary of the Army concurs in these views but is unable to offer any assistance to the corps in the foreseeable future in view of the limited number of

supergrade spaces allotted to the Department of the Army. The committee believes that additional supergrade positions for the civil-works program are justified and appropriate because of the scope, complexity, and importance of the program. Many precedent statutes have authorized supergrade positions for other agencies and departments since the Classification Act of 1949.

SECTION 210

Section 210 amends authority to license land areas for forest and land management.

Under existing law (sec. 4 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946) the Secretary of the Army is authorized to lease lands under certain conditions and subject to certain provisos, looking toward the sound management of the land for the public welfare. There is no provision, however, for permitting the licensee to undertake certain conservation practices such as the felling and disposal of timber on a sustained-yield basis or otherwise, since this is considered to be property of the United States. This restricts the licensee in carrying out recognized conservation practices and does not benefit the United States. The receipts from the sale of timber under a sound management program would normally be much less than the cost to the licensee of carrying out the entire land and forest management program for park or recreational purposes and therefore it is only equitable that these receipts be used for furthering the basic development program. This section is designed to permit public agencies who have leased reservoir lands to cut timber and harvest crops so as to promote the most beneficial conservation plan and to utilize the proceeds, if any, in carrying out these conservation practices. Safeguards against the abuse of this procedure and against any inordinate enrichment of the licensee through the sale of marketable timber or crops are contained in the provision which states that any balance of the proceeds not utilized in the conservation program shall revert to the United States. There have been many instances where the need for this provision has been demonstrated, and in view of the increasing number of reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, the proposed modification is timely and in the best public interest.

SECTION 211

Section 211 states that title II of the bill may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1954," and is included for reference purposes.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as amended, are shown as follows (new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman, and stricken language is set forth in black brackets):

SECTION 7 OF THE ACT APPROVED AUGUST 18, 1941 (PUBLIC LAW 228, 77TH CONG.), AMENDED BY SECTION 5 OF THE ACT APPROVED JULY 24, 1946 (PUBLIC LAW 526, 79TH CONG.), FURTHER AMENDED BY THE ACT APPROVED JUNE 16, 1953 (PUBLIC LAW 60, 83D CONG.)

That 75 per centum of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood[-]control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood[-]control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein.

SECTION 8 OF THE ACT APPROVED JUNE 28, 1938 (PUBLIC LAW 761, 75TH CONG.)

That there is hereby authorized an expenditure [of not to exceed \$375,000 per annum,] as required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a [current information service on precipitation, flood forecasts, and flood warnings,] network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary examinations and surveys or works of improvement authorized by the law for flood[-]control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes, and the Secretary of [War] the Army upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure.

SECTION 2 OF THE ACT APPROVED AUGUST 28, 1937 (PUBLIC LAW 406, 75TH CONG.), AMENDED BY SECTION 13 OF THE ACT APPROVED JULY 24, 1946 (PUBLIC LAW 526, 79TH CONG.)

That the Secretary of [War] the Army is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed [\$1,000,000] \$2,000,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than [\$50,000] \$100,000 shall be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year.

SECTION 4 OF THE ACT APPROVED JULY 24, 1946 (PUBLIC LAW 526, 79TH CONG.)

The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of [War,] the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the [War Department,] Department of the Army, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of [War] the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable[:] in the the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal [rentals] considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area[:] for any public purpose, when the Secretary of [War] the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable[:] : *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of

fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance, and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of [War] the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of [War] the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

○

Union Calendar No. 775

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9859

[Report No. 2247]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 12, 1954

Mr. DONDERO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JULY 15, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

4 SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of
5 rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood
6 control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and author-
7 ized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary
8 of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in
9 accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions

1 recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective
2 reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provi-
3 sions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved
4 March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Con-
5 gress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects
6 authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth
7 with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of
8 improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
9 tion and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein
10 set forth in full:

11 Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered
12 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

13 Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and
14 New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-
15 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

16 Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash
19 the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the
20 Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently
21 estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

22 Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$4,400,000;

25 Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document

1 Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$525,000;

3 Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
4 bered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$375,000;

6 Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document
7 Numbered 405, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$694,000;

9 Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document
10 Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$166,400;

12 Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Num-
13 bered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in
15 cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently
16 estimated as \$23,000;

17 Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Num-
18 bered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$135,000;

20 Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut:
21 House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$112,500;

23 Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$32,200;

1 Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered
2 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$31,928,000;

4 Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House
5 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an
6 estimated cost of \$138,000;

7 Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document
8 Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$1,973,900;

10 Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Num-
11 bered 229, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$469,400;

13 Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake
14 Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered
15 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,-
16 000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution
17 for the construction of all bridges, including approaches
18 thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard
19 heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

20 Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document
21 Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
22 of \$31,900;

23 Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Mary-
24 land: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

1 Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland:
2 House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$29,000;

4 Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland:
5 House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at
6 an estimated cost of \$192,600;

7 Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House
8 Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
9 mated cost of \$20,300;

10 Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Num-
11 bered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required
13 of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs
14 between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

15 Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland:
16 House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$45,100;

18 Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Num-
19 bered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$678,300;

21 Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay,
22 Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second
23 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

24 Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered
25 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

1 Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia:
2 Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

4 Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Docu-
5 ment Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
6 cost of \$95,000;

7 Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered
8 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

9 Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina:
10 House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$108,000;

12 Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Num-
13 bered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$102,000;

15 Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson
16 Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411,
17 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

18 Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Water-
19 way: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Con-
20 gress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

21 Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina:
22 House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at
23 an estimated cost of \$765,000;

1 Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered
2 110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;

3 Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Docu-
4 ment Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
5 mated cost of \$82,200;

6 Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered
7 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;

8 Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
9 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
10 \$98,000;

11 Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George
12 Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second
13 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

14 St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
15 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$1,312,000;

17 Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered
18 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$5,778,000;

20 Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Num-
21 bered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$70,000;

23 Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Docu-

1 ment Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$520,000;

3 Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document
4 Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
5 of \$6,875,000;

6 Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document
7 Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$74,300;

9 Aransas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intra-
10 coastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

12 Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

14 Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House
15 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already per-
17 formed by local interests on this project, in accordance with
18 recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribu-
19 tion required of local interests;

20 Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
22 mated cost of \$82,600;

23 Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document
24 Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$65,000;

1 Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House
2 Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
3 mated cost of \$142,000;

4 Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate
5 Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a
6 monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of
7 the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document
8 Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland
9 River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", au-
10 thorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is
11 hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment
12 of the project hereby approved;

13 Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Docu-
14 ment Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
15 cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system
16 work;

17 Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document
18 Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional esti-
19 mated cost of \$219,900;

20 Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Num-
21 bered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$220,000;

23 Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document

1 Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$217,200;

3 Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Num-
4 bered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25
6 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to
7 exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required
8 by the project document;

9 Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Docu-
10 ment Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
11 mated cost of \$225,000;

12 Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

14 Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Num-
15 bered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$174,000;

17 Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New
18 York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Con-
19 gress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

20 Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New
21 York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Con-
22 gress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;

23 Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$2,459,000;

1 Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California:
2 House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress,
3 at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secre-
4 tary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local
5 interests for such work as they may have done upon this
6 project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests
7 insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers and found to have been done in accordance with the
9 project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such re-
10 imbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable
11 thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take pre-
12 cedence over other pending projects of higher priority for
13 harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such
14 payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

15 Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California:
16 House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress:
17 *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of
18 entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and cen-
19 tral basin recommended in the project report and presently
20 estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum
21 of the cost thereof;

22 Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered
23 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$5,437,000;

25 Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate

1 Document Numbered 83, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
2 mated cost of \$3,758,700;

3 Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reeds-
4 port, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-
5 first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

6 Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington:
7 House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

9 Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the
10 head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

12 Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washing-
13 ton: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Con-
14 gress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

15 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House
16 Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
17 mated cost of \$421,800;

18 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Break-
19 water), Washington: House Document Numbered —,
20 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$323,700;

21 Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Num-
22 bered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
23 \$179,300;

24 Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered

1 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
2 \$139,250;

3 Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document
4 Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
5 cost of \$1,366,650;

6 Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Num-
7 bered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
8 \$436,000;

9 Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document
10 Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$3,397,300;

12 Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document
13 Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$477,900;

15 Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington:
16 House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$395,500;

18 Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Num-
19 bered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$425,550;

21 Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
22 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

23 Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
24 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

1 Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$3,022,000;

4 BEACH EROSION

5 Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document
6 Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
7 of \$140,000;

8 Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
9 Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
10 of \$189,000;

11 Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
12 bered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$402,900;

14 Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
15 Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
16 cost of \$409,000;

17 South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document
18 Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$166,550;

20 Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecti-
21 cut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress,
22 at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach;
23 \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

24 New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3),

1 Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect
3 Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf
4 Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

5 Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut:
6 House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at
7 an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000
8 for Seaside Park;

9 Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
10 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
11 \$2,044,000;

12 Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
13 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$105,000;

15 Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey:
16 House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$260,000;

18 Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered
19 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

20 Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered
21 380, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

22 Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Num-
23 bered 28, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$1,176,400;

1 Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$185,000;

4 Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Num-
5 bered 502, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
6 \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White
7 City Park;

8 Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House
9 Document Numbered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an
10 estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

11 Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York:
12 House Document Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at
13 an estimated cost of \$136,500;

14 Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House
15 Document Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$3,874,000;

17 Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document
18 Numbered 349, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

20 Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
22 cost of \$73,700;

23 Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document
24 Numbered 227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$283,700.

1 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
2 ized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them
3 on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, sub-
4 sequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which
5 form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work
6 which may have been done on these projects was approved
7 by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
8 projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reim-
9 bursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable there-
10 to for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence
11 over other pending projects of higher priority for improve-
12 ments.

13 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
14 ized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and
15 survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from
16 the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, in the
17 vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable pro-
18 visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

19 SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to
20 the city of Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their
21 successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend
22 Channel, in the county of Mobile, Alabama, by the construc-
23 tion and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said
24 channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama:

1 *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be com-
2 menced until the plans and location therefor have been filed
3 with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States
4 Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision
5 shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the
6 causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years
7 and completed within five years from the date of this Act and
8 the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby
9 expressly reserved.

10 SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor
11 Act of 1954".

12 TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

13 SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22,
14 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
15 amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938
16 (Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall
17 apply to all works authorized in this title except that for
18 any channel improvement or channel rectification project,
19 provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of
20 June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise
21 provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any
22 flood-control project herein adopted requiring local coopera-
23 tion shall expire five years from the date on which local
24 interests are notified in writing by the Department of the
25 Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said

1 interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory
2 to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation
3 will be furnished.

4 SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of
5 December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-
6 eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to
7 projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein
8 set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works
9 of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
10 tion and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein
11 set forth in full.

12 It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress
13 that the following provisions shall be observed:

14 No project or any modification not authorized, of a proj-
15 ect for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized
16 by the Congress unless a report for such project or modifica-
17 tion has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers,
18 United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

19 SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the
20 benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-
21 waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized:
22 to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the
23 Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in ac-
24 cordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-
25 after designated and subject to the conditions set forth

1 therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications,
2 and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project
3 authorized in this title with funds from appropriations here-
4 tofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready
5 for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*
6 *further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated
7 as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be con-
8 sistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*,
9 That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible
10 future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall
11 be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construc-
12 tion by the Department of the Army when approved by
13 the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the
14 Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

15 CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

16 That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecti-
17 cut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936
18 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
19 amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide
20 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of
21 the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers,
22 of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene,
23 New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs here-
24 tofore authorized.

1 That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecti-
2 cut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three
3 reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend
4 sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in
5 section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December
6 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to
7 by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers,
8 and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in
9 June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the
10 eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control
11 Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

12 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

13 The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity
14 of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby
15 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
16 tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-
17 bered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$4,469,000.

19 CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

20 The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood
21 control and other purposes in central and southern Florida
22 given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as
23 amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the

entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the authorized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all work over and beyond that previous authorization such conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress, based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*, That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan authorized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15,

1 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified
2 and expanded to include the following items of work and the
3 authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

4 (a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock
5 for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of
6 the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated
7 February 2, 1954, as concurred in by the report of the Chief
8 of Engineers dated April 8, 1954, with such modifications
9 as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable
10 at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation
11 lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000 in-
12 crease in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under
13 the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the
14 Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which
15 \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this
16 paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire
17 such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be
18 necessary for construction of the project except that local
19 interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the
20 Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended,
21 with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main
22 line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by
24 the United States in connection with this item: *And pro-*
25 *vided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the

1 required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engi-
2 neers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds
3 herein authorized to be appropriated.

4 (b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Missis-
5 sippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City,
6 Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the
7 Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53,
8 Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of
9 \$440,000.

10 (c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicks-
11 burg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report
12 of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85,
13 Eighty-third Congress.

14 (d) Modification of the authorized project for the New
15 Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the rec-
16 ommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document
17 Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
18 of \$1,743,000.

19 BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEXAS

20 The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide
21 flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as author-
22 ized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939,
23 and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in ac-
24 cordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

3 BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

4 The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the
5 Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek,
6 Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
7 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
8 Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there
9 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,-
10 000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

11 GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

12 The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and
13 San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substan-
14 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
15 Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third
16 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

17 GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

18 The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas,
19 authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act author-
20 izing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain
21 public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes",
22 approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such au-
23 thorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and
24 Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction,

1 operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secre-
2 tary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers
3 of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the
4 provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir
5 shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approx-
6 imately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which
7 three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for
8 flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood con-
9 trol, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for
10 sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of develop-
11 ment of electric power, at an estimated total cost of
12 \$13,300,000.

13 The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Fed-
14 eral Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate
15 to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation,
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may
17 appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-
18 flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such
19 allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable
20 costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net
21 increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage
22 capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and
23 Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation.
24 No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for

1 development of electric power shall be made under this sec-
2 tion unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such in-
3 stallation will actually be constructed.

4 The costs allocated to local interests under this section .
5 shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by
6 them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act.
7 The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon
9 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the
10 appropriation available for maintenance and operation of
11 such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such
12 operation and maintenance ; the \$1,400,000 to be con-
13 tributed during the construction period shall be deposited to
14 the credit of the appropriation available for construction of
15 the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that pur-
16 pose ; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief
17 of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon
18 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of
19 the United States.

20 Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon
21 Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by
22 the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance
23 with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accord-
24 ance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, opera-

1 tion, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local
2 interests and with such power to be made available to such
3 local interests.

4 Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward
5 the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir,
6 \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time
7 or times during the period of such construction, as the
8 Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the
9 contributions allocated to local interests under section 2, with
10 interest thereon at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per annum,
11 shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over
12 a period not in excess of fifty years.

13 The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement
14 with local interests providing for the payments heretofore
15 described and for all other matters relating to the operation
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which
17 require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement
18 may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water
19 conservation and stream-flow regulation for development
20 of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide
21 that the utilization of water for power development shall not
22 be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimenta-
23 tion purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized sub-

1 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
2 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185,
3 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

4 UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

5 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River
6 in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized sub-
7 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
8 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397,
9 Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of
10 \$2,500,000.

11 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River,
12 Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby au-
13 thorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
14 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
15 Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the
16 improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Hen-
17 derson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost
18 for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

19 The project for flood protection on the Missis-
20 sippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8,
21 Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially
22 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
23 Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third
24 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

1 The project on the Mississippi River for local flood
2 protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illi-
3 nois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
4 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
5 Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
6 mated cost of \$7,046,300.

7 The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa
8 River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance
9 with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
10 Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an
11 estimated cost of \$979,600.

12 MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

13 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
14 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for
15 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri
16 River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers,
17 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and
18 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

19 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
20 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
21 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
22 project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tribu-
23 taries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in
24 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Con-
2 gress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and
3 there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition
4 to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

5 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
6 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
7 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
8 project for flood protection on the Osage River and tribu-
9 taries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with
10 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House
11 Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

12 The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June
13 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys,
14 Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood
15 Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modi-
16 fied to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute
17 not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of
18 flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the
19 lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Pro-*
20 *vided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal
21 Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of
22 the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor
23 shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project
24 reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-
25 of-way, and public relocations which local interests would

1 have been required to bear had the approved Government
2 plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total
3 amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the
4 work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

5 The project for flood protection on the Chariton River,
6 Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in
7 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
8 neers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Con-
9 gress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

10 The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux
11 River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is
12 hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accord-
13 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers,
14 in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress,
15 at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

16 The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri
17 River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby
18 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
19 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Num-
20 bered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
21 \$212,300.

22 COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

23 The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and
24 tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in
25 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

3 OHIO RIVER BASIN

4 The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek
5 at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is
6 hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the
7 recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Docu-
8 ment Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$570,000.

10 The project for flood control and related purposes on the
11 Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substan-
12 tially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House
13 Document Numbered , Eighty-third Congress, at an
14 estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the
15 local cooperation recommended in that document, local
16 interests shall comply with the provisions of local coopera-
17 tion contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act
18 approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also con-
19 struct and maintain local drainage works required to fully
20 and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally
21 as outlined in House Document Numbered , Eighty-
22 third Congress.

23 KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

24 The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo
25 River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized sub-

stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California, approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

1 The plan of improvement for flood control on the Ameri-
2 can River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in
3 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
4 neers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

6 LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

7 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
8 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for
9 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower
10 San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of
11 December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by sub-
12 sequent Acts of Congress.

13 COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

14 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
15 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for
16 the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia
17 River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was author-
18 ized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and
19 these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power
20 development in the following projects in tributary basins, sub-
21 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
22 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531,
23 Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of
24 McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on
25 Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White

1 Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam
2 River, Oregon.

3 TERRITORY OF ALASKA

4 The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tribu-
5 taries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-
6 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in
7 House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress,
8 at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

9 TERRITORY OF HAWAII

10 The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream
11 and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii,
12 is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-
13 ommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
14 Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
15 of \$347,000.

16 SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
17 ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and sur-
18 veys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel
19 and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by
20 or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction
21 of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United
22 States and its Territorial possessions, which include the fol-
23 lowing-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or
24 formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or
25 work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no

1 supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made
2 unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the
3 Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to
4 be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such
5 review is required by the national defense or by changed
6 physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the
7 Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any
8 project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor
9 mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed
10 work shall have been adopted by law:

11 Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

12 Neponset River, Massachusetts.

13 Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Penn-
14 sylvania in the interest of flood control.

15 Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

16 Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

17 Coos Bay, Oregon.

18 SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the
19 sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated
20 for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the
21 prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be
22 carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of
23 December 22, 1944, as amended.

24 SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August
25 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Con-

gress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

“That 75 per centum of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein.”

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

“That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as

1 required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter
2 made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related pur-
3 poses by the United States, for the establishment, operation,
4 and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of
5 recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as
6 the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the
7 Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau
8 such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary
9 examinations and surveys or works of improvement author-
10 ized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and
11 related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the
12 recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to
13 allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure.”

14 SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of
15 August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood
16 Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended
17 to read as follows:

18 “That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
19 allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations here-
20 tofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood
21 control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris,
22 and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable
23 streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the
24 Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of
25 flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall

1 be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from
2 the appropriations for any one fiscal year.”

3 SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by
4 section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without
5 regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there
6 shall be established in the civil works activities under the
7 jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, seven positions to be
8 placed in grade GS-16 and two positions to be placed in
9 grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by that
10 Act.

11 SEC. 210. That section 4 of the Act approved July 24,
12 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), is
13 amended to read as follows:

14 “The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
15 Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain,
16 and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir
17 areas under the control of the Department of the Army,
18 and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation
19 of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also author-
20 ized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities
21 thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such
22 terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in
23 the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organ-
24 izations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at
25 reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the pub-

1 lie service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises:
2 *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal,
3 State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases
4 where appropriate, may be granted without monetary con-
5 siderations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion
6 of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secre-
7 tary of the Army determines such action to be in the public
8 interest, and for such periods of time and upon such con-
9 ditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That
10 in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local
11 governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for
12 the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests,
13 or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be
14 authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be neces-
15 sary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize
16 the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the develop-
17 ment, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such
18 lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid
19 to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary
20 of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas
21 of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally,
22 without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and
23 other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit
24 from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs
25 shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is

1 determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary
2 to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations
3 as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use
4 of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted
5 which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish
6 and game of the State in which such area is situated. All
7 moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges
8 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as
9 miscellaneous receipts.”

10 SEC. 211. Title II may be cited as the “Flood Control
11 Act of 1954”.

83d CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 9859

[Report No. 2247]

A BILL

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DONDERO

JULY 12, 1954

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

JULY 15, 1954

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 27, 1954
For actions of July 26, 1954
83rd-2nd, No. 141

CONTENTS

Alaska.....5	Foreign affairs.....17	Puerto Rico.....8
Appropriations.....2,21,27	Foreign aid.....2,27	REA Audit Report.....14
Atomic energy.....1,13	Forestry.....38,39	Reclamation....11,20,28,30
Budget.....22	Hawaii.....5	Reports.....14
CCC.....14,38	Health insurance.....19	Seeds.....38
Credit unions.....6	Livestock.....36	Social security.....32
Customs simplification...3	Loans, farm.....7,16,37	Soil conservation....9,15
Dairy industry.....23	Minerals.....29	Statehood.....5
Disaster relief....7,16,37	Personnel.....10,34	Surplus commodities....18
Education.....33	Poultry.....21	Taxation.....9,13,16,36
Electrification.....31	Price supports.....25	TVA.....24
Farm program.....12	Public debt.....22	Water rights.....35
Flood control.....4,26		

HIGHLIGHTS: House committees reported mutual security appropriation bill and cleared it for debate. House passed atomic energy bill. House received conference report on tax revision bill. House passed customs simplification bill. House passed flood control bill. House Rules Committee tabled Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill. Senate debated atomic energy bill. Senate committee reported upper Colo. reclamation bill. Sen. Williams and Rep. Moulder introduced drought-relief bills. Sen. Douglas submitted and discussed resolution for joint committee on drought relief.

HOUSE

1. ATOMIC ENERGY. Passed, 230-154, with amendments H. R. 9757, the atomic energy bill (pp. 11389-90).
2. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on July 24, during House recess) H. R. 10051, the mutual security appropriation bill, 1955 (H. Rept. 2490)(p. 11485). The Rules Committee reported a resolution waiving points of order on the bill (p. 11474).
3. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10009, to provide for review of customs tariff schedules, to improve procedures for tariff classification of unenumerated articles, and to repeal or amend obsolete provisions of the customs laws (pp. 11398-400).
4. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed without amendment H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood control bill, which authorizes \$20,000,000 additional for watershed work by this Department (pp. 11411-47). Rejected, 19-69, an amendment by Rep. Smith, Miss., to require that land be purchased under this bill so as to facilitate recreation (pp. 11438-40).

5. STATEHOOD. The Rules Committee tabled a request for a rule to send to conference H. R. 3575, the Hawaiian statehood bill, as amended in the Senate to include also Alaska (p. D899).
6. CREDIT UNIONS. Passed as reported S. 3583, to transfer administration of D. C. credit unions from Treasury to HEW (pp. 11401-2).
7. DISASTER RELIEF. Received from the President a message reporting on disaster-relief activities; to Appropriations and Public Works Committees (H. Doc. 479) (p. 11397).
8. PUERTO RICO. Mr. Fernos-Isern spoke on development of Puerto Rico since it became a Commonwealth (pp. 11475-7).
9. TAXATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 8300, the tax revision bill (pp. 11448-73). The conferees agreed to the Senate changes in the provision to encourage soil conservation expenditures (p. 11456).
10. PERSONNEL. S. 2665 as reported (see Digest 138) provides as follows:
 - "(1) A 5-percent increase in the minimum rate of each grade, through grade GS-17, of all employees paid under the Classification Act of 1949, with a minimum increase to each employee of \$180 a year. The bill also provides an increase of 5 percent for legislative employees with no minimum provision.
 - (2) An increase in the number of supergrade positions provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, from 400 to 550, apportioned as follows: GS-18, 31; GS-17, 123; and GS-16, 396.
 - (3) Longevity step increases (presently provided for employees through grade GS-10) for employees through grade GS-15. These longevity steps are in the same amount as the present within-grade promotion steps, except that for GS-15, which has within-grade promotion steps of \$250 each, each longevity step increase will be \$200. In effect, no employees in grades GS-11 through GS-15 may count past service for more than one longevity step increase under the bill.
 - (4) Authority for the Civil Service Commission to recruit qualified employees above the minimum rate of the grade for the position to which appointment is made in cases where a sufficient number of qualified eligibles cannot be secured at the regular entrance rate.
 - (5) Abolishment of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule. The 116,000 employees paid under this schedule will be divided into two groups. The first group of approximately 69,000 will have their pay set by local wage boards. The second group of approximately 47,000 will be paid under the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. This will be worked out over a period of time by the Civil Service Commission under procedures provided for in the bill.
 - (6) A system of premium compensation for classified employees, including overtime compensation at $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the regular rate of basic compensation not in excess of the top salary grade for GS-9 or the regular straight-time rate, whichever is greater; night differential at the rate of 10 percent of the regular rate of basic compensation; holiday pay (not overtime) at a rate equal to the regular pay in addition to such regular pay; standby time at appropriate rates determined by department heads with the approval of the Civil Service Commission (except for fire fighters) not in excess of 25 percent of the regular rate of basic compensation for GS-9; and extra pay at rates up to 15 percent of base pay for employees (such as criminal investigators and certain others) whose hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively and who must perform substantial quantities of irregular, overtime, or night duty. Fire fighters will receive the premium compensation benefits, but are not restricted by the

under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 5. The provisions of this amending act shall become effective as of July 1, 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of Chief of Police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Chief of Police be increased by more than five longevity increases."

"SEC. 2. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"(1) \$390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"(2) \$208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator or tillerman of a fire department hose wagon, pumper, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance;

"(3) \$390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"(4) \$208, while he is assigned to duty as chief photographer."

"SEC. 3. Section 202 (b) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In computing service in the grade of Inspector for the purpose of determining longevity increases, service in excess of 3 years rendered prior to the effective date of this act in the grade of private, when the individual was assigned to duty as a fire inspector or assistant marine engineer shall be considered service in the grade of inspector.'

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of its enactment, except that the amendment made by section 2 shall take effect on July 1, 1953."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS as a substitute for the committee amendment:

"That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of this section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of chief of police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of chief of police be increased by more than five longevity increases."

"SEC. 2. Section 102 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this sec-

tion, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

"SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 202 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 201 of this act in the grade or rank of Fire Chief shall not be increased by more than 4 longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Fire Chief be increased by more than 5 longevity increases."

"SEC. 4. Section 202 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

"SEC. 5. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"(1) \$390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"(2) \$208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator of a Fire Department hose wagon, aerial-ladder truck, rescue squad, or Fire Department ambulance;

"(3) \$390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"(4) \$208, while he is assigned to duty as a chief photographer."

"SEC. 6. Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, shall take effect as of July 1, 1953, and section 5 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of the enactment of this act."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will explain this in order to throw a little more light on why this substitute was added?

Mr. KEARNS. May I inform the gentleman that when the bill was considered in committee at its last meeting we had overlooked the longevity privileges of 14 firemen who had not had longevity made retroactive to January 1, 1953. There is also one corporal on the police department who was eligible.

Furthermore, on the longevity matter, we found that the police officers who received longevity were the Chief of Police who only received four, which was cor-

rect, because he receives a greater salary than the other officers.

This is merely perfecting language to language that was not submitted in the original act or was not clarified in the original act.

Mr. McMILLAN. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that completes the bills on the District of Columbia Calendar.

RIVER AND HARBOR, BEACH EROSION, AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9859, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9859, generally referred to as the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, comes to the floor of the House after a long series of hearings by our subcommittees and the hearings held by the full Committee on Public Works.

This bill adopts 85 river and harbor projects, located in 29 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, with a total estimated cost of \$212,915,100.

It also adopts 22 beach-erosion projects, located in 12 States and the Territory of Hawaii, with a total estimated cost of \$14,003,664.

It also adopts 33 flood-control projects with a total estimated cost of \$294,852,750 and authorizes the modification of 8 projects heretofore approved by Congress.

The 8 authorizations for previously approved projects, including \$20 million for watershed work being prosecuted by the Department of Agriculture, amount to \$368,500,000.

The 140 projects in the bill are located in 41 of the 48 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if any of those projects are in the State of West Virginia?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not able to answer that offhand, but I will answer the gentleman before the debate is over.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman that there were seven projects authorized in the district that I represent. Back in 1946 we started work on the Sutton Reservoir, and when the Korean trouble came on, that was dropped. The other 6 are still there. Nothing has been done about them despite the fact that they have been authorized since 1938.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, if they have been authorized, then they are beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works of the House and are a subject for the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know that I used the proper term in saying "authorizations." They were authorized by the Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Then it is a subject for the Committee on Appropriations. I might say to the House that certainly all of the projects that were submitted to our committee are not included in this bill, because, if they had been, this bill might have been double or more than the sum total that we bring to you. The total amount in this bill is about \$890 million.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to advise the gentleman and the Members of the House that just this past week, on Sunday last, a disastrous flood hit the area right where some of these projects have been authorized. Had they been constructed, it would not have been necessary for the Federal Government to expend vast sums of money, which they have done in the past 2 or 3 days, and we are trying to rebuild bridges and restore homes and property that has been damaged.

Mr. DONDERO. Those are acts of God.

Mr. BAILEY. That would not happen if the Congress were alert to the situation that exists there. This is the area in which 85 or 86 people have been drowned in the last 10 years in this type of flood, and apparently nothing has been done about any of those authorized projects.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman will show his interest before the Committee on Appropriations in the next session of Congress.

H. R. 9859 carries a total authorization of \$890,271,514. Appropriations for civil works for the fiscal years 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955 have amounted to more than \$1,563,000,000. In fact, this bill carries a total authorization that is approximately \$30 million less than the civil-works appropriations for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

The 1950 bill left the House with an authorization total of \$1,117,586,175. This bill carries an amount nearly a quarter of a billion dollars less than the 1950 House bill—the last omnibus bill.

At the present time approved active projects for navigation and flood control will cost an estimated \$7,566,533,000 to complete. Projects amounting to an estimated total cost of \$2,534,030,000 are deferred pending further study, while projects amounting to slightly more than a billion dollars are in an inactive status due to changed economic conditions and

other factors arising subsequent to authorization.

In the process of developing this bill, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], held 42 meetings. The Subcommittee on Flood Control, headed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], held 41 meetings. Every project in the bill was carefully considered, and both proponents and opponents were given time to present their testimony. With only 2 or 3 exceptions, all projects were given unanimous approval both by the subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Throughout the numerous hearings held by subcommittees on the projects proposed, the Corps of Engineers presented the technical details of each project. Almost from the beginning of our history as a nation, the Corps of Engineers has been charged with the responsibility for navigation and harbor work, and, later, for flood-control projects. Its record in civil-works construction stands as a monument to this efficient agency of the Federal Government and to the fine work of its officers and civilian personnel. The corps deserves the highest commendation, and I am sure that every member of the Committee on Public Works joins me in this statement.

At this time I wish to publicly commend Mr. MACK and Mr. ANGELL, the chairmen of the Subcommittees on Navigation and Flood Control, for their diligence in carrying on the hearings. This year our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] completes 16 years of service in the House of Representatives, and I am sure all of us regret that he will retire at the close of this Congress. He is a man of outstanding ability and has been most diligent and attentive in his committee duties and congressional work throughout the years. He has a splendid record of service to the people of his district, the State of Oregon, and the Nation. The House, I am sure, will greatly miss him.

I recommend that this bill be given favorable consideration. I hope it will pass. It is not as large a bill as the former bill which came to the floor in 1950. It is of less amount. The reason that it should not be in an excessive amount is the fact that we have a backlog in this country of river and harbor and flood-control projects which will total about \$10 billion. It would take almost 12 years to complete if they started work now. So that the necessity for a large bill is not here. This is a reasonable bill. I hope that the House will do as the Committee on Public Works did, support the bill unanimously.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I take this time simply to express my personal appreciation, which I know is shared by the Members of the House, for the uniform courtesy and consideration shown by the gentleman's committee and all of its mem-

bers to those of us who have projects we feel are deserving projects. I believe the gentleman and his committee have rendered an important service in bringing this bill to the floor, and I want the Record to show my appreciation for the diligence and efforts of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman from Florida has taken the words right out of my mouth. The gentleman from Michigan should have yielded to me first. I, too, wish to congratulate the chairman and the members of this committee on bringing out this bill. Particularly, in behalf of the people of the Second Congressional District of the State of Washington, I want to express appreciation of the committee having heard me in testimony before the committee and having included six different projects from that area in this bill. It seems to me it is real recognition of the rivers and harbors in the far Northwest.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for their comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has devoted more hours to the work of this committee than any other and is more responsible for the provisions of this bill than any other is our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL is chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. He also is the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. Mr. ANGELL attended every session of both of those committees. Mr. ANGELL is the outstanding authority in the Congress on rivers and harbors and flood control. He has contributed much to his State, to the Pacific Northwest, and to the Nation.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] had intended to be here today to deliver his final speech in Congress, of which he has been a Member for 16 years. Illness, however, prevents that. He has requested that I ask that his remarks be inserted immediately following the remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], I ask unanimous consent that his remarks may be inserted at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I approve this bill and urge its adoption. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee it has been my privilege and duty to preside over the hearings which we have been conducting before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee dur-

ing much of the time of the 83d Congress, with a view to passing upon the merits of the various river and harbor projects eligible for inclusion in this bill. There has not been an omnibus bill for rivers and harbors since 1950 and as a result there is a large accumulation of projects which have been examined in the field by the Corps of Army Engineers, approved and cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Public Works Committee. Our committee includes all such projects in one bill which has come to be known as an omnibus bill which permits the Congress to pass on all projects at one time rather than have them scattered throughout the session by individual bills. This procedure is a desirable one and results in the saving of much time for the Congress and at the same time gives adequate opportunity to pass upon the merits of each individual project included in the omnibus bill. Opportunity is given on the floor for any Member to make a motion to strike any particular item from the bill, which insures majority rule.

The Committee on Public Works, which under the Reorganization Act, has jurisdiction over rivers and harbors, flood control, public roads, and public buildings, has taken the opportunity during the 83d Congress to make inspection trips over most areas in the United States and to visit most of the important rivers and harbors in order to get first-hand information on the ground, as to the various projects coming before the committee for action. These trips included one along the Atlantic coast, through the New England States and along the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, down the Mississippi and along the Gulf States, the central portion of the United States in the Ohio River area and on west to the Pacific coast, including the States of Montana, Idaho, California, Washington, Oregon, and the Columbia Basin area.

During these inspection trips we made actual examination of the projects on the ground and gleaned much local history and factual information as to the merits and demerits of the various projects. At the conclusion of these field examinations I set down for hearings before the subcommittee the rivers and harbors and beach erosion projects which were eligible for inclusion in the bill.

I have heard it said that there is a backlog of approved rivers and harbors projects which would require many years for completion by the Army engineers and some comment to the effect that those should be completed before new projects should be considered. However, an examination by our committee into the merits of this suggestion and the appraisal of the projects now on the approved list as well as the new projects which are urgently needed to meet changing conditions shows the lack of merit in the suggestions and the necessity for authorizing the construction of many new projects urgently needed and the elimination of some projects heretofore approved which by reason of changing conditions are no longer justified.

It may be of interest to consider the background of river development and a bit of the history surrounding it as well as some statistical information which our committee has gathered in the various hearings we have held.

The water transportation system of the United States began with the founding of the Nation and recognition of Federal responsibility in navigation stems from the very beginning of these public works. Our committee has been advised by the Corps of Army Engineers that 1,769 authorizations on river and harbor projects have now been completed. There are a few multiple-purpose projects which include some navigation not included in this list. The total cost of this river improvement program was \$856 million.

Projects or modifications which are now under way but not yet completed total 143. The committee records show that the projects underway involve an additional cost of \$1,409,000,000 of which \$878 million has been appropriated through the fiscal year 1954 and it is estimated that \$531 million will be required to complete the projects.

In addition to the projects completed or underway there is another group not yet started totaling 254 in number, the total cost of which would be \$911 million of which \$5 million has been appropriated to date for planning purposes, leaving a total of \$906 million to complete the construction of the projects.

It is thus seen from these tabulations that the total active navigation program amounts to 2,156 projects or project modifications, having a grand total of \$3,176,000,000 of which \$1,739,000,000 for the cost to date has been appropriated and \$1,437,000,000 is the estimated cost to complete. These estimated costs to complete are based on the 1953 price levels.

In addition to the active program the Army engineers considering navigation projects have deferred for restudy 282 projects. These deferred projects are estimated to cost, if constructed, \$1,170,000,000. The active authorized navigation program described included about 28,600 miles of improved waterways, about 300 locks, 200 dams, and 290 commercial harbors. This embraces all authorized navigation projects from those not yet started to those fully completed.

It is thus seen that the comprehensive program for river and harbor development throughout the United States has proceeded throughout our history on a coordinated program in which each project is based on careful and extended engineering studies authorized by the Congress and eventually submitted to the Public Works Committees having been cleared by the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget.

It is at this point in the proceedings that the work of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate take over to determine whether or not authorization for any specified project should be granted. The omnibus bill we are considering embodies the results of our deliberations and includes the projects which in the judgment of the

committee are in the national interest, economically feasible, and desirable in furthering the needs of water transportation of the Nation both for war and peace.

The latest commercial statistics which are available are for the year 1952 and show that the net waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890 million tons in that year, of which about 660 million tons were domestic and 230 million tons were foreign. This is a 50 percent greater waterborne commerce than the prewar peak in the year 1929. The statistics given to our committee in the consideration of the 1950 Rivers and Harbors Act, which was the predecessor to the present one, then amounted to an alltime total of 760 million tons reached in 1947, which has now been exceeded by more than 11 percent. In continuously mounting volume through the war years, traffic grew on the inland and intracoastal waterways of the United States, each year setting a new record in ton-miles of bargeborne freight. It should be recalled that in addition to their value as carriers of commercial cargo, the inland waterways were used to float 3,943 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary war equipment from inland shipyards down to the ocean. America's rivers and canals thus served a twofold purpose during the war. They shared importantly in the transportation of strategic materials and they made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes that otherwise would have been forced into congested coastal areas, with the hazards of bomb attack.

As I have said, this omnibus bill is the first one proposed since 1950 and needless to say it includes a large number of projects which have been accumulating. It covers 140 projects including 22 under beach erosion programs, with an estimated cost for the 140 projects of \$890,271,514. Under the law governing beach erosion projects they are permissible only for the protection of public property and two-thirds of the cost must be borne by local interests and one-third by the Federal Government. It is estimated that the cost of beach erosion projects will be \$14,300,664.

It is the thought of a good many students of our economic programs and national economy that it is a wise move for the Federal Government to have public projects of this nature examined and approved by the Army engineers so that their worth and economic feasibility may be established and have them available on the shelf of approved projects in the event of the need for public works to bolster our economy. In the meantime, however, such of the projects as are urgently needed for immediate construction are cleared for appropriation to enable construction to start.

I call attention to the fact that our committee is a legislative committee and merely authorizes projects and before construction can proceed the Appropriation Committee must provide the funds.

The economy of the United States, the foremost nation in the world, is based upon our immense wealth of natural re-

sources and our productive capacity and know-how in this highly developed machine age. It behooves us to guard well our natural resources and exercise every effort for their preservation, utilization, and full development in order that we may continue to hold the front rank of the nations of the world in the ability to produce the necessities of life not only for our own people but for many of the less fortunate peoples of the world.

The late Theodore Roosevelt, as President of the United States in 1908, made a great contribution to this program for the conservation, development, utilization of our natural resources, and particularly the forest, minerals, waters, and soil. He said:

Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.

Running water is a most valuable natural asset of the people, and there is urgent need for conserving it for navigation, for power, for irrigation, and for domestic and municipal supply.

The improvement of our inland waterways can be and should be made to pay for itself as far as practicable from the incidental proceeds from waterpower and other uses. Navigation should, of course, be free, but the greatest return will come from the increased commerce, growth, and prosperity of our people. For this we have already waited too long. Adequate funds should be provided, by bond issue if necessary, and the work should be delayed no longer. The development of our waterways and the conservation of our forests are two most pressing physical needs of the country. They are interdependent and they should be met vigorously, together, and at once. There is urgent need for prompt and decisive action.

President Theodore Roosevelt in pleading for the conservation and development of America's natural resources was only following the sage advice of another great American statesman of long ago, Daniel Webster, whose words are chiseled in the plaque over our Speaker's rostrum:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

As in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, there was need, as he said, for prompt and decisive action in the conservation and development of these great natural resources, so today we in our time and generation will be derelict in our duty and shortsighted in our vision if we fail to provide the necessary funds and legislation needed to conserve and protect to the full these great natural resources which belong to all the people and which are being wasted and depleted. Unless we make possible the full use of our water, forests, soil, and hydroelectric power we will be unable to meet the heavy demands upon our economy and to provide for our own people the high standard of living they now enjoy, and at the same time to perform our full part in maintaining a peaceful and stable world.

As we visualize the immense billions the United States has expended around the world in attempting to bring peace to the world and good will among men of all nations, we cannot help but be impressed with the necessity of ending

the worldwide race in armament in this age of the atomic and H-bombs and returning to international cooperation and the spiritual and moral values which dominated our forebears, with the hope that the millions expended in armaments and wars may be turned into channels of peace and internal improvements and improved standards of living in order to overcome hunger, disease, illiteracy, and despair which have been the prime causes of wars.

I believe with President Eisenhower—

We are prepared to reaffirm with the most concrete evidence our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government is ready to ask the people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of any savings achieved by real disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be: To help other peoples to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom. The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: Roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs rather than the fears of the world.

Mr. Chairman, there are no projects in this bill in my congressional district. There are, however, a few projects in Oregon, of which my district is a part, which I desire to call to your favorable consideration. One of these is the deepening of the channel of the Columbia River at the mouth from 40 to 48 feet and dredging jetties and providing groins if necessary in order to give safe access to the Columbia River ports of the large volume of waterborne traffic on the river. The use of the entrance channel as it exists today at times presents great hazards and danger to shipping.

There are some 18 port districts now formed on the Columbia River from its mouth to its confluence with the Snake. The Snake River is the most important tributary of the Columbia and with its great gorge—the deepest in the United States—it presents ideal conditions for the construction of dams, storage lakes, and hydroelectric-power projects, as well as providing river transportation. The dams on the Snake will not only provide navigation, flood control, reclamation, and the generation of hydroelectric power at the dam sites, but will provide an immense storage basin for preventing floods and also for storing water to increase the generating capacity of the many hydroelectric installations downstream on the Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Oregon, which I am privileged to represent, borders on the Columbia River and is in a strategic position in this great area, the Columbia River Basin. Truly the Pacific Northwest stands at the threshold of a coordinated regional development. The development and full utilization of the Columbia Basin's natural resources are the keys to the economy of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Fortunately the money invested in the development of these huge hydroelectric projects is a sound investment for the United States. The payout is ahead of schedule on the

Bonneville project in my district and long before the amortization period expires the Federal Government will have received back the full cost with interest, upkeep, and maintenance. During the 16 years I have had the privilege of serving the people of the Third District of Oregon, I have devoted much of my time to the problems of conserving, developing, and utilizing to the full the great storehouse of natural resources in the Columbia River Basin. Few regions are blessed with such wealth of resources. The immense volume of water and hydropower of the Columbia River coupled with fertile soil and an equitable climate provides a combination of factors which spell success and prosperity in the Pacific Northwest region.

This is true both from an industrial standpoint where great blocks of cheap hydroelectric power are needed and for agricultural development as well, which also requires both power and water.

The Pacific Northwest is a rich and growing region; it has immense natural resources of forests, agricultural and grazing land, water supply, minerals, fish and wildlife, scenic and recreational areas. With about 9 percent of the Nation's land area and 3 percent of the people, the Pacific Northwest has 40 percent of all merchantable timber, 20 percent of all irrigated acreage, 4 percent of all cropland, 20 percent of all developed waterpower, 40 percent of all potential hydroelectric power, 60 percent of all phosphate rock; large deposits of lead, zinc, silver, copper, and other minerals; 4,680,000 people in April 1950—a gain of one-third over 1940. The basic region deficiencies are oil, gas, and coal. To overcome these deficiencies it is imperative that we develop the immense pool of hydroelectric power with which we are blessed, with almost one-half of the available United States potential supply. Only some 11 percent has been developed thus far.

The Columbia River Basin is the greatest natural source of water and power resources not only in America but anywhere in the civilized world. By reason of the large drainage basin it covers, the river's flow is to a large extent continuous through most of the year, resulting in an unusual percentage of firm power in hydroelectric projects. This is an exceptionally valuable asset to large industries which need continuous firm power to maintain plant operation.

The growth of power requirement in the Northwest is the result of an extremely rapid growth in population coupled with expansion in electrification of farms, businesses, and industries in the area. In population growth, the Pacific Northwest has far outstripped the United States as a whole. In the period between 1940 to 1950, which is the major development period of the Bonneville Power Administration, the population of the State increased almost 50 percent. Besides having a population increase, more electricity than ever before is being used by all classes of customers. Farm, business, and industrial enterprises are rapidly finding new uses for power, and home consumption is steadily increasing.

I feel justified in having been a vigorous advocate of the development of these great resources of the Northwest not alone because they spell prosperity for the area, but because they are sound investments for the Nation as a whole. This Nation in the exercise of wisdom, instead of curtailing the development of these great revenue-producing projects, should make available the necessary funds for full development as rapidly as the demand for electric energy requires. Federal funds invested in these public works is in the interest of economy.

During my service I have seen the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects through the development stage. We are now well advanced in construction of the McNary Dam and Chief Joseph project on the Columbia and in the early stages of construction of the Dalles project on the same river. The Columbia River and its tributaries has the greatest potential storehouse of electric power of any waterway in the Nation, some 20 million kilowatts, of which only 11 percent has been developed, as I have said. The remainder of this great source of energy and power is flowing to the sea without let or hindrance, with a resulting loss of untold wealth to our people and the loss of millions in revenues which would come into the coffers of the United States. The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts which is equivalent in energy to 8,800,000 barrels of oil. Only 15 units of the Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28 million barrels annually. When McNary Dam is completed, the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts, and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions, 5 million barrels will be consumed. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be in round numbers 290 million barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydropower in our future economy.

Unfortunately we have no large deposits of gas, coal, or oil in the Pacific Northwest, but the enormous pool of hydroelectric power stored in the Columbia and other rivers compensates for this loss. The McNary Dam project alone will provide the necessary energy for industries which will have a total investment of \$100 million and which will supply employment to 100,000 residents of the Northwest. It is estimated that benefits to navigation from this great dam will reach a million dollars a year, and it will reduce pumping costs for the lands adjacent to the pool approximately \$300,000 a year. The power alone generated at this huge project will return to the Government \$17,500,000 a year to produce which 3 million tons of coal or 11 million barrels of oil would be required. It is significant to recall that hydroelectric power is not expendable like oil, gas, or coal, and that as long as the sun shines and water falls this great

source of energy will work around the clock in the interests of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest.

While the hydroelectric power potential of the Columbia River and its tributaries, the greatest in the United States, is of immense value to the entire region and to the Nation, nevertheless this great waterway with its continuous flow of a huge volume of water available down through the centuries for navigation, reclamation, domestic and industrial use, is of greater value and is one of the greatest assets that is possessed by any area anywhere in the world.

We in this great new continent of America, with its wealth of natural resources, should not underestimate the favored position in which we find ourselves and the blessings that are ours. As has been said, let us confess that our great good fortune is not because we in America are one whit better or more deserving of God's blessings, but simply because we have the tremendous virgin resources of a new continent to divide among only 160 million skilled people, while in Asia nearly 1,500,000,000 unskilled people must divide the meager resources of a long-used continent.

The Columbia River from its source in Canada down through the great hinterland lying between the Pacific Ocean and the Continental Divide is a natural outlet for the commerce of this great region. The water-level haul from the Pacific Ocean through the Columbia River and Snake River Gorge to Lewiston in central Idaho serves an area equal to an empire in scope. On the bosom of this great river the heavily laden barges move to and fro from the ocean as far as the river has already been developed for transportation. The United States Corps of Engineers' Report 308, approved by the Congress, covers a comprehensive plan for the full development of this great river basin and when the projects there listed and approved have been fully constructed transportation on this great river will be provided from the Pacific Ocean to Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, another project included in this bill is a flood-control authorization for the Columbia River and Willamette River Basins under the Flood Control Acts of 1938 and 1950. The comprehensive plan of development for the Columbia River Basin will produce numerous benefits throughout the area. The main control plan, including such reservoirs as The Dalles, which is under construction, together with the levees, floodwalls, and bank-protection projects, will reduce flood damages in the lower basin by more than 90 percent. The plan of improvement, in addition to controlling floods on the lower Columbia River, will also provide effective control on the Willamette, Kootenai, and Snake Rivers, and maximum protection economically feasible on other tributaries. The projects of the plan will also permit full development and extend inland navigation on the Columbia, Snake, and Willamette Rivers. In addition, the multiple-purpose reservoirs will greatly increase the presently available power capacity of the Federal projects in the basin. Other benefits accruing to the

plan of improvement are those resulting from the irrigation of arid lands, pollution abatement, domestic and industrial water supplies, and recreation. Many benefits are not subject to monetary evaluation but nevertheless are very realistic; these include prevention of loss of life, improved standards of living, and stabilization of business and employment.

The committee was informed by representatives of the Corps of Engineers that, based upon an appropriation schedule designed to permit economical and orderly progress on continuation of needed flood control and related works in the Columbia River Basin, it is estimated that an amount of approximately \$75 million will be required during fiscal year 1956, and an amount of approximately \$115 million will be required during fiscal year 1957. These amounts are about \$180 million in excess of the available monetary authorization. The committee has therefore included authorization in the bill in the amount of \$180 million for continuation of the comprehensive plan.

The major portion of this authorization is needed for The Dalles Dam project. This is a most important project in the economy of the Pacific Northwest and is proceeding full speed at the present time. It is one of the most important projects for power on the Columbia River, only second to Grand Coulee.

With each passing year it is more plainly evident that the most dynamic influence on the economy of the Northwest is coming from the harnessing of the great power potentials of its large and numerous streams. The Columbia River and its tributaries carry an amount of water which represents approximately one-fourth of the annual runoff of the major power streams of the country. When fully developed this great river alone can provide approximately 30 percent of the hydroelectric power generation of the entire country. When other streams of the Northwest are added the total is in excess of 40 percent. As of January 1, 1953, only 11.6 percent of this total capacity had been utilized through operating plants. Projects now under construction or authorized will bring this total to near 15 percent of the potential.

But this partial harnessing of the great power resources has been sufficient to literally electrify or energize the economic life of the Northwest and to demonstrate the essentials of future plans for logical and orderly development.

Not only are the installed capacities and undeveloped potentials impressive when compared with the country as a whole, but the low costs of power generation make this the area of lowest power prices in the United States. The benefits of this low-cost hydropower have been made widely available to the domestic consumers of the Northwest and a matching low level of rates has been provided for industry. This has had great significance in the Nation's war and postwar defense program.

The rapid growth of the aluminum reduction industry in the Pacific North-

west is the result of alert action by leaders of the region and progressive development of cheap hydroelectric power. There were no aluminum reduction plants in the area prior to 1940. However, by 1944 the Pacific Northwest's capacity to produce aluminum from alumina—shipped in from other areas—amounted to 310,000 net tons, or 28 percent of the national total. By December 1952 the region's capacity had grown to 498,300 tons, an increase of 58 percent over 1944, and to 41 percent of the national capacity. The Big Three of the aluminum industry—Alcoa, Kaiser, and Reynolds—have been in the region for some time. It is expected that 104,000 tons of new capacity may be added during 1954—by the Harvey Machine Co., 54,000 tons, and the Anaconda Copper Co., 50,000 tons. For continued expansion of the aluminum and other industries there will have to be rapid development of more hydroelectric power, which is the region's greatest resource. Luckily, it is not exhaustible like natural gas or oil, and some other forms of energy.

I urge favorable consideration of two other Oregon projects in the bill, Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.—Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress, 2d session—and Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River, at Reedsport, Oreg.—Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress, 2d session.

The Rogue River is located in the southwest corner of Oregon, draining 5,080 square miles. The river generally flows westward into the Pacific Ocean 264 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River and 319 miles north of San Francisco. The plan of recommended improvement provides for two jetties at the entrance of Rogue River, a channel 13 feet deep and 300 feet wide from the ocean to a point immediately below the State highway bridge, and widening channel at a point 0.25 mile below highway bridge to form turning basin 13 feet deep, 500 feet wide, and 650 feet long.

Estimated cost	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$3,758,700	\$163,800	\$3,922,500
Current.....	3,758,700	163,800	3,922,500

In addition to the direct benefits that would accrue if the improvement is constructed, business would be stimulated, property values increased, and utilization of the Nation's timber resources would be increased. Trucking is at present the only form of transportation in the area. This project is in the area of a large stand of commercial timber, much of it owned by the Federal Government. Water transportation is urgently needed to market the ripe timber both privately and federally owned.

The Umpqua River, Oreg., empties into the Pacific Ocean 178 miles south of the mouth of the Columbia River. Scholfield River rises south of the Umpqua River and flows northwestward about 13 miles to its confluence with Umpqua River at Reedsport, Oreg.

There is no existing project on Scholfield River. This project for Umpqua River provides for a jetty-protected en-

trance channel 26 feet deep and a river channel 22 feet deep, 200 feet wide, and about 11 miles long to Reedsport; together with turning and mooring basins and various widths and depths to Gardiner, Oreg.

The plan of recommended improvement provides for a channel in Scholfield River 12 feet deep, generally 100 feet wide, from its confluence with the Umpqua River to a point 0.5 mile below the first railroad bridge, a distance of 2 miles, the entrance to be widened to 300 feet in a distance of 500 feet.

Estimated cost	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$41,000	\$10,000	\$51,000
Current.....	41,000	10,000	51,000

Local interests have offered to provide additional terminal facilities on the Scholfield River as needed, and to contribute \$10,000 toward the first cost of the improvement if the dredged material is deposited in a specified area. The Chief of Engineers recommends acceptance of this cash contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this may be my last opportunity to say a farewell to you and my colleagues. One of the greatest joys of my 16 years' service here has been this wealth of friendships with you, my colleagues, which I will cherish as long as God grants my stay on earth. The seemingly endless days of toil and frustrations have knit together the strong and abiding ties of personal associations and friendships. With you I have tried with such power as God has given me to build a better America, to provide for all our citizens high and low the blessings of freedom and a sharing in the bounties with which divine providence has blessed us.

Mr. Chairman, since I am ending my 16 years' service in the Congress I may be pardoned for a personal reference. My background has been such as to instill in me a deep and abiding interest in the abundant natural resources of the Pacific Northwest. My parents came to Oregon by ox team in 1852, where I was born and raised, and I have spent all of my life in Oregon and much of it in working for the conservation, development, and utilization of these vast natural resources. For many years I was engaged on public-land surveys in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, which gave me an opportunity to secure firsthand information of the extent, the character, and the value of the unmatched natural resources of this great area. This, as well as my training and experience as a lawyer, has enabled me here in the Congress to plead with my colleagues for the development of these resources which has resulted in favorable consideration at their hands. I take some pride in reporting that in the years in which I have served in the Congress the Columbia River has received in authorizations and appropriations for the development of navigation, reclamation, hydropower, and flood control deserved favorable consideration. It has

received more appropriations for public works, many times over, than in any other like period in history.

Mr. Chairman, two subjects involving national legislation have been foremost in my entire service in the Congress. One is the conservation, development and utilization of the immense wealth of natural resources of our Nation on which our economy depends and which I have discussed in these remarks. The other is the adoption of a Federal old-age security program, nationwide, which will deal justly with the aged, handicapped and disabled who otherwise would be in need and want. If we are to preserve the American way of life and our economic and democratic processes under free enterprise, we must find a solution not only for our unemployment problems but also for the problems of providing adequate care for the aged and disabled. With an accelerating advance in technology in the postwar era, and with the commercial development of atomic energy presaging more rapid transitions in mass production, the social risks and hazards of unemployment and old age are increased. Rather than see workers pushed from active labor force, hit-or-miss, the logical policy to follow is one of selection. The older group has earned retirement. Many of them are not covered by the Social Security Act. By covering the entire group, the whole process of business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption without which our mass production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in our Nation.

The aged, through no fault of their own, through the fiat of industry, are denied a part in production. They toiled the longest in production and should not, when old, be deprived of taking part in consumption. They are the victims of an industrial system for which they are not responsible. Society owes a duty to these old folks, and it can only perform this duty by establishing a national annuity system providing against the hazards of old age and disability. There are now millions among us, 60 years of age and over, who are not now being cared for in an honorable and just way by the present system of social security, and are receiving no support from any source, or hopelessly inadequate support.

The plan which I have advocated and sponsored during my congressional service would replace the complicated, arbitrary, and inequitable provisions of the existing law. It is financed by a gross income tax in which all participate. It is a pay-as-you-go system, and annuities will be paid currently each month out of currently raised revenues. This proposal gives recognition to the past labors of the aged and would offer them dividends from the wealth of American industry which they helped to create. These annuities are provided for those self-respecting American citizens as a matter of right, without reference to need or prior contributions, and with

neither the stigma of charity nor the aroma of poverty.

I take considerable satisfaction in knowing that during the years of my work here, the Congress has from time to time enacted amendments to the social-security system under which a gradual advance has been made toward a solution of this most important old-age security problem. The coverage has been materially increased to take in many thousands of worthy citizens who otherwise would be without help, and the monthly payments have been substantially increased. However, the ultimate goal has not yet been achieved; namely, a nationwide system which will cover all and which will provide adequate annuities so that these worthy and deserving citizens will have ample income in their declining years to live with decency and health in accordance with the living standards of their friends and neighbors. Ultimately the full goal, I am sure, will be attained.

Mr. Chairman, during all my service in this great forum I have labored ceaselessly and ever with a fervent desire and hope that this great peace-loving Nation and the freedom-loving nations of the world find a solution to the conflicts and devastating wars between the nations of the world.

This troubled world seeking ways to solve its problems should be turning increasingly to those inexhaustible spiritual resources of divine strength and moral courage as a practical way to rebuild better government, better society, and friendly cooperation in a misguided and distraught world beset with wars, greed, and selfishness. How these fundamental spiritual values can be applied to solve the problems that face the world today is your problem and mine, and may indeed, determine the destiny of this great Republic.

God grant that the time will come in our time when the leaders of all nations of the world, realizing the dreadful cost of war in human life and national wealth, and its utter futility in the solution of international, political, and economic problems, will be willing to sit around the conference table and decide the problems which now separate them, by peaceful negotiation instead of by bombs and guns. If the lives lost in war were devoted to useful occupations and the betterment of mankind, and the immense sums of money expended in the preparation of war, waging war, and the care of the injured and rehabilitation of the destruction wrought by war, were devoted to useful purposes such as great public works throughout the nations, river and harbor improvements, hydroelectric production, hospitals, schools, roads, public and private housing, higher standards of living for the downtrodden, and old-age security, the millennium would indeed have been reached.

Somewhere down through the ages we have lost the sustaining faith of our Founding Fathers that the Almighty is on our side; that He "moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform." As the late Senator Vandenberg said:

With unwavering fidelity we must carry on the great adventure of life, but if there be

any failure, let not the blood be upon our hands, nor the tragedy upon our souls. The United States has no ulterior design against any of its neighbors anywhere on earth. We can speak with the extraordinary power inherent in this unselfishness. We need but one rule. What is right? Where is justice? There let America take her stand.

Let us follow in the footsteps of the immortal Lincoln who in the dark days of 1865 said:

With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I also would like to pay homage to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors for his hard and diligent work on this omnibus rivers and harbors bill, also to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] and also the illustrious chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. May I say, too, that during these many months of hearings the minority side was represented at all times, and I should like to pay tribute to the minority members for the long hours they worked on these hearings.

The projects that are in this bill have had long study by the Army engineers. There were also many hearings held on each and every project by the subcommittee. Then they were reported to the full committee, and the full committee spent long hours going over the work of the subcommittee.

We feel that these are new and important projects and that they are necessary to be authorized at this time so that in the near future the Committee on Appropriations can act. All of these projects are in this country. All of them are for the expansion of our own economy. I feel that in an ever-growing country we need to keep pace with the business of the country and expand our rivers and harbors, also protect the investment of many farms and cities with flood-control projects. I do feel it is a good bill. It was passed unanimously by our committee. I urge this House to adopt it today.

On January 9, 1953, I introduced a bill in Congress, H. R. 9520, calling for the deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to 35 feet and its widening to 450 feet, as well as other improvements recommended by the Army engineers. The proposed project has been approved by the Federal Bureau of the Budget, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and has the endorsement of the Baltimore Association of Commerce, as well as other leading port interests. The Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives held hearings on my bill and approved it unanimously for inclusion in the rivers and harbors and flood control omnibus bill, which is being considered by the House today.

I need not remind my colleagues of the important and useful part that water transportation plays in the national economy. Fortunately for us, the Federal rivers and harbors program has produced the best system of navigable water-

ways and harbors possessed by any nation. The Congress has appropriated to date more than \$4 billion for improving and maintaining these waterways and harbors. But there are some weak links in this strong national chain of water transportation. And standing out like a sore thumb is the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

Generally the improvement of our waterways has been a progressive development in an effort to keep pace with the growth of maritime commerce and the requirements for national defense. But the facts show plainly that the improvement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal has not kept pace. Here is the picture.

The present canal is a bottleneck between the two great Atlantic ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia. The proposed project will join these two cities by direct deepwater route, thus adding substantially to the combined service which they can render on behalf of the Nation's waterborne commerce, both domestic and foreign. Considering that this project is only about 46 miles in total length, its completion will come close to making the 2 ports as 1. At a very nominal cost compared to the resultant benefits from eliminating the existing bottleneck, the long and expensive voyage of some 300 miles now required for larger ships plying between these ports by way of the Virginia Capes can be avoided. As a matter of simple economy, the savings in time and increased flexibility of ship operations are sufficient to justify the improvement.

As a result of the Federal program for navigation improvements, channel depths of 35 feet or better now prevail at principal harbors on the Atlantic seaboard or gulf coast. The existing 27-foot channel in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal does not permit the full loading of vessels as at these ports. It is wholly inadequate to handle ocean liners and modern tankers often loaded to depths of 33 feet. The proposed deepening to 35 feet will provide the necessary depths to meet shipping needs and will benefit the whole Atlantic coast through increased shipping.

The present canal of 250-foot width is not a safe waterway. In addition to insufficient depths there are three leading hazards for vessels—the narrow channel, bad bends, and bad bridges. In the past, tankers have been wrecked and tied up in the canal for months or a whole season. The proposed widening of the canal to 450 feet, easing of bends and provision of new bridges will provide a much safer waterway, in addition to eliminating the costly delays.

Baltimore is one of the Nation's leading ports in total inbound shipments of merchandise and serves as a gateway for a wide range of manufactured commodities, grain, and other agricultural products from the West. Development of new iron ore fields in Labrador will serve to supply additional traffic in the future. Major steel companies interested in these new fields are now planning the construction of large ore carriers, as well as other facilities, which will make the port of Baltimore the largest and most modern ore unloading facility of

any port in the country. In addition, major railroads serving Baltimore have long recommended that the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal improvements be carried out, as the improved canal would permit the movement of full shiploads of coal from the rail terminals at Baltimore to the New England areas. It stands to reason that modernizing the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal would, through increased foreign and domestic trade, serve to aid the growth of the Nation as well as the port of Baltimore.

This waterway has great potential value for national defense. Records indicate that the canal was particularly valuable to the Nation during World War II. Further, if improved, it would provide Baltimore with two 35 feet or better exists to and from the sea, the only major port in such a position. The protected passage between Baltimore and Philadelphia enlarged to real seaway proportions would accommodate our large naval vessels, such as destroyers and cruisers, and would be of greatly increased value to our defense and security.

As sponsor of this project, I most earnestly endorse the widening and deepening of the inland waterway connecting the Delaware River with Chesapeake Bay and feel it even more necessary now than ever before because of the great challenge presented by the St. Lawrence seaway to the ports of the Atlantic.

The people of Maryland have had a close interest in the canal reconstruction for the past three decades. To them, the proposed project to convert it into a major deep sea waterway is like a dream come true.

I maintain and recommend that this project should be promptly authorized in order that modernization work may soon be initiated in the interest of the growing economic needs and safety of the Nation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, because of the vital role of the Philadelphia port area in our national defense effort, the project of deepening the Delaware River from Philadelphia-Camden to the Trenton area to 40 feet is a matter which concerns not only the civil authorities, businessmen, and citizens of this locality but the Nation as a whole.

More than a year ago the United States Steel Co. began production at its new Fairless plant on the Delaware River below Morrisville, Pa., near Trenton, N. J. Consequently the Philadelphia-Camden area has become one of the Nation's greatest steel producing districts. The operation of this multimillion dollar integrated steel plant, its subsidiaries and other related industries in the area demands the facility of oceangoing transports as they require a marked increase in waterborne tonnage. This factor alone should justify the modification of the Delaware River Channel above Allegheny Avenue to Trenton to accommodate seagoing ore boats, colliers, tankers, and other deep draft vessels. An improved channel

would also provide for the shipment of finished steel by water freight direct from the steel companies' docks.

By opening up the Delaware River to the city of Trenton, a vast hitherto untapped area can become useful to defense production and economic development over and above the extent to which it is being utilized at present. The Fairless steelworks has brought to the Morrisville area many satellite companies whose output is suitable to defense production.

The United States Army Corps of Engineers has made a thorough study of conditions in the Delaware River Channel. They have recommended improvements to navigation on the Delaware River that would add some 60 miles of deepwater harbor capabilities which will result in a large increase in low-cost transportation in this great and rapidly expanding commercial district. The Corps of Engineers also specifically stated that the benefits to the defense program and future normal peacetime economy by improving navigation on the Delaware River are such as to warrant construction of the project. The requirements by local interests for an increased depth of channel were found to be real and essential. It has also been found that the depths of water in our seaports and channels are limiting factors in the marine design of tankers and bulk cargo carriers.

There can be no question as to the importance of the Delaware River Valley to the national economy and national defense. The Congress would certainly be justified in authorizing this project and appropriating the necessary funds as recommended by the Corps of Engineers as well as the civic and industrial leaders of the Philadelphia-Camden area.

As pointed out in the following editorial from today's Philadelphia Inquirer, deepening of the Delaware River Channel is recommended by all elements of labor because of its significance to the economic future of Delaware Valley, United States of America:

UNITED DELAWARE VALLEY BACKS DEEPER CHANNEL BASIN

Rarely does the United States Congress have before it a measure which commands such united and wholehearted support as the proposed allocation of \$91 million for deepening the upper Delaware River channel to Trenton.

Doubly effective is the support now coming from both railroads and rail labor. Ordinarily one might expect them to hesitate before endorsing expansion of a competing medium of transportation. But as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers stated, in a letter to Members of Congress:

"We feel the railroads of this territory would have an increase in business, making more work for railroad employees."

This general viewpoint was driven home in letters and statements by officials of both the Pennsylvania and Reading Railroads, by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

Lined up in solid support, too is the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, with former President James L. McDevitt sending a persuasive letter to Senator Prescott S. Bush, chairman of the Public Works Committee which unanimously approved the measure.

It is this aggressive and vigilant mobilization of public opinion which gives Delaware Valley its best hope of getting the channel project through Congress at this session. The biggest obstacles we face are not outright opposition, based on active objection, but (a) the danger of the channel bill being swamped, lost or forgotten in the rush of Congress toward adjournment, and (b) the many other money claims for other projects which Congress must consider.

That's why it is vital to keep hammering home the main theme—the overall goal—of the deeper channel to Trenton: Expansion of Delaware Valley, and with it expansion of prosperity for the Nation.

We can think of no one measure more likely to spur the Eisenhower program of prosperity than the deeper Delaware channel.

No theory is involved here. Proof is at hand. Delaware Valley is growing fast. Visibly. Needed is the deeper channel so this march forward will be neither halted nor slowed down—but aided in creating more industries, more employment, more homes.

It has been said that keeping everlastingly at it brings success. That is a good motto for all of us in these windup days of Congress.

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. GRANAHAH. Mr. Chairman, there has been concern expressed by some Philadelphians and others interested in the proposed project for the improvement of the Delaware River channel from Philadelphia to Trenton that it is not included in this omnibus authorization bill. I want the RECORD to show that this project is very much in my mind as this bill comes before the House and that there is a very valid reason why it has not been included in this bill.

First of all, the project for the Delaware River cleared the various administrative hurdles—approval by the Board of Engineers, the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and so on—only after the schedule for hearings by the House Public Works Committee had been made up.

While it might still have been possible to have the House hearings reopened or continued to include the Delaware River project, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Chairman MARTIN, of the Senate Public Works Committee, agreed to hold hearings on this project before his committee and this was done. There is no doubt that the Delaware River project is slated for inclusion in the omnibus bill now before us when that bill gets over to the Senate.

Under those circumstances, and in view of the fact that no hearings on this matter were held by the House committee, it is our feeling that there would be no value in an attempt here to have the project written into this bill from the floor. It could do more harm than good, for if it were voted down on the grounds that the House committee had not had an opportunity to hold hearings on it, it might jeopardize the chances of having the project retained in the final conference bill, assuming the Senate writes it into the measure in the first place.

It should perhaps be explained, Mr. Chairman, that the House and Senate Public Works Committees try insofar as possible not to duplicate hearings on the same projects, unless strong opposition

should develop in a particular area to a project approved for that area by the House committee. In that event, the Senate committee will often hold a hearing to review the House action. But normally, if the House committee schedules certain projects for hearings, the Senate committee will schedule other projects for its hearings, and in that way they cover double the amount of ground without duplicating their efforts.

So I am perfectly satisfied in this matter that it was good strategy to have Senator MARTIN's committee in the Senate conduct the hearing on the Delaware River project for two reasons: first, it came out of the Army so late that there was a strong possibility House committee hearings could not be arranged for it in time for inclusion in this bill; and, second, Senator MARTIN is thoroughly familiar with the importance of this project and could be expected to show more than routine interest in it.

All things considered, then, there is no reason for concern that the Delaware River project is not included in the House bill, since it will certainly, I am sure, be in the Senate version. Once that occurs, it will be up to all of us in the House who are anxious to see this project go through to make sure that it is included in the final conference bill.

I noticed several days ago the Philadelphia Inquirer expressed concern editorially about this matter, urging a floor fight to get it into the House bill. I hope my statement clears the air on this, and explains why no such floor fight is being made at this time.

Everybody admires a good fight, but there is no sense in fighting just for the sake of fighting, and particularly when a fight might jeopardize rather than help in the achievement of our goal.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to members of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives for their favorable action in authorizing construction of urgently needed levees along the American River near the city of Sacramento. This is one of the very important flood-control measures included in the omnibus public works authorization bill. The committee was faced with an extremely difficult job in considering the many important public-works projects proposed for authorization, but they did the job expeditiously and efficiently.

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Washington, Congressman MACK, who is chairman of the subcommittee responsible for action on flood-control matters. His most courteous treatment of me and of officials from the Sacramento area in discussions of the matter—and the courtesies extended us by the other subcommittee members—is highly appreciated.

The action approving this important levee will be of great help to one of the fastest growing residential and industrial areas in the United States. The full growth of the area has been blocked by floods and the threat of floods. Flood danger soon will become greater because

of the construction of Folsom Dam upstream from Sacramento.

The important dam, which is part of the flood-control network of the Central Valley project, is designed to release a maximum of 115,000 cubic feet of water per second, and engineers expect this maximum release to be made at regular intervals as rain from winter storms or spring runoff from melting snows rush into the reservoir. This will mean that the force of floods in the area to be protected by the Amercian River levee would be diminished, but their frequency would be increased.

By approving the project, therefore, the Congress will be recognizing its responsibility for correcting a situation made worse by previous governmental action. In addition, the levee will add a flood-safe area where homes and businesses can be established by the many persons moving into our section of California.

May I express again the sincere thanks of the people of the Third Congressional District for the action of the committee and of the entire House of Representatives in helping them solve a difficult problem.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9359, and I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the other members of the Committee on Public Works, for reporting out what in my opinion is one of the best bills of this type that has ever been reported to the House for consideration.

I am particularly grateful to the chairman and the members of the committee for approving the Old River control structure project because the hearings before the Public Works Committee established that this project could be properly classed as an emergency project.

The Old River closure project is in no wise a local project. It cannot be defined as a project affecting only the State of Louisiana. Rather, it is a project affecting most of the Southern States directly, and the entire United States indirectly. So in thanking the distinguished chairman and members of the committee for approving this project I speak for a great majority of our fellow Americans living throughout the entire Mississippi Valley. By approval of this project and the plans and specifications of the Army engineers in constructing the project, no doubt the Atchafalya River will be prevented from capturing the Mississippi River at its confluence with Old River and following the shortest course to the Gulf of Mexico. If such a diversion had been allowed to take place, in all probability, the damage to the economy of the Mississippi Valley would have been in the billions of dollars.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am already on record in endorsing the proposal to improve the inland waterway connecting the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware River. I extend and reaffirm that endorsement.

Considering the great benefits to be derived from the improved Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the cost must be viewed as nominal. From the standpoint of national defense, the deepwater connection between the great ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia has already proved to be of primary importance. Its usefulness in time of emergency would be increased considerably by the improvements recommended by the Chief of Engineers. During wartime, ships plying this inland waterway would be completely protected from the danger of hostile craft. Unquestionably this would be a contribution to national defense of the first magnitude.

The improvements to the Chesapeake and Delaware Waterway will be important to the peacetime economy also. The canal provides a short, inland route for oceangoing vessels moving between Baltimore and New York, Boston, and Europe, and South America. Reports indicate that a saving in time of 20 hours will be realized by the average vessel enroute from Baltimore to the Delaware River area.

An immediate economic benefit would be an improvement of the water transportation service to the thousands of industrial concerns situated in the region. It is reasonable to expect that good water transportation facilities will attract additional industries to the region.

The arguments are overwhelmingly favorable to the completion of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal proposal. Therefore I urge that action be taken to proceed with this project without delay by adopting the provision contained in this bill H. R. 9859, for the widening and deepening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. It merits our support.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard work that has been expended by the members of the Public Works Committee upon this measure, and I shall give it my support. However, I am disappointed that the committee failed to accept the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers with reference to proposed projects for the Holla Bend levee district and the Conway County drainage and levee district, both of which I believe to be essential to adequate protection of valuable land against recurring floods on the Arkansas River. I trust that these projects will be embraced in this measure before final action is taken by the Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation, and I am sure that of all my colleagues from Illinois, to the distinguished chairman and members of the committee, especially the able Illinois member, Mr.

KLUCZYNSKI, who so outstandingly champions the best interests of Chicago and the Nation, for including the beach-erosion program. It is of great interest to our people—not only to the people of the district I have the honor to represent, but to the people of other districts in Chicago. We do appreciate the action of the committee. May I ask one question which I will be asked to answer when I go home to my people. Referring to page 96 of the report, I notice that the city of Chicago is required to pay a larger part of the cost than suburban communities. May I have an answer to that question?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the chairman of our committee, if he has the record before him so that he may answer the gentleman from Illinois. I do not remember the details of all 92 projects.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 96 of the report that suburban communities will pay a less percentage of the cost than will the city of Chicago. I presume there is a good reason for it, but I will be asked that question when I go home and I would appreciate an answer from the chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. I will look into the matter and answer the gentleman later, before we conclude debate.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the chairman very much. The district that I have the honor to represent runs along Lake Michigan from 39th Street southward and we have a vital interest in the program emanating after long study from the Corps of Engineers and which offers a promising solution to the problem of beach erosion that has been perplexing us. Naturally I would not wish the city of Chicago, which already is sorely pressed to find the money for the many services required of it, is to receive less aid in proportion than other communities. It is true that we have along the lakefront in Chicago more and finer public bathing beaches than any city in the world. These are maintained by the people of Chicago for all the people, both our own residents and those we are delighted to have visit us and share with us our beaches, our parks, and the other attractions of our great and happy metropolis. I presume that this figures in the apparent discrepancy of the percentage of Federal aid Chicago will receive to that authorized for neighboring communities. I am sure the distinguished chairman's statement will clarify the matter.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, 4 years have passed since the last omnibus rivers and harbors bill was passed by Congress and therefore many projects are now demanding attention. The Corps of Engineers has carefully screened these projects and selected for approval only those which were considered of the greatest importance, either to the area in which they were located, or to the Nation as a whole, and frequently to both.

The navigation system has been the responsibility of the Federal Government since the Nation was founded, and the investment made in the program has

resulted in substantial and widespread benefits from the standpoint of economics and national welfare. It has contributed to foreign and domestic commerce and to the security and growth of the Nation.

Of vital importance to the port of Baltimore is the proposed program recommended for the inland waterway from the Delaware River to the Chesapeake Bay, known as the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The completion of this work would greatly affect the volume of shipping through the port of Baltimore, now the second largest port on the east coast, and on which the economy of the city of Baltimore, and in fact, the whole State of Maryland depends.

In the past, many of the larger ships have bypassed Baltimore because the canal has not been of sufficient width and depth to enable them to use it. To have availed themselves of the facilities offered by the port of Baltimore would have entailed many additional miles of travel. For example, the use of the canal would reduce the travel distance from Baltimore to New York or New England ports by 150 miles, and between Baltimore and many European ports, by 115 miles, which would mean a saving in operational costs as well as in sailing times.

The widening and deepening of the canal, and the replacement of movable-span bridges with high-level fixed structures, as proposed in H. R. 9859, will go far toward making the port of Baltimore more accessible to the large vessels.

The improved waterway will also provide an inland route from Philadelphia to Cape Henry, connecting two of the Navy's principal shipyards. Furthermore, it would permit the transportation of coal from the newly developed coal fields in West Virginia, through the local rail terminals in Baltimore, to the new England area, at considerably less expense.

Navigation through the waterway at the present time is exceedingly hazardous and results in much damage to vessels and bridges. Some accidents have tied up traffic there for weeks at a time. Improving the canal by increasing the depth to 35 feet and the width to 450 feet, is essential as an aid to navigation and would permit two-way, day and night traffic, by large vessels.

On the basis of past traffic through the canal, which has, incidentally, far exceeded all expectations, there is every reason to believe that future traffic will avail itself of the use of the canal to the greatest extent the canal will permit.

In times of war, the inland waterways developed at the Government's expense, have been a valuable asset. During the last war, the inland waterways were used to float almost 4,000 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary equipment from inland shipyards to the ocean. The Chesapeake and Delaware Canal accommodated 924 trips by naval vessels, mostly Coast Guard and the auxiliary naval craft. Furthermore, as part of the inland waterway system, ships were able to avoid the hazard from enemy submarines between the Chesapeake Bay and the Delaware Bay entrances, thus reducing the amount of

convoying required. The proposed improvements would increase its value and potential, should there be another emergency, and also permit vessels of larger size to avoid the ocean route.

In addition to their importance in the transportation of strategic materials during the war, the inland rivers and canals made possible the widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes, that otherwise would have been forced into the already congested coastal areas.

Some concern has been expressed as to the possibility of the pollution of the Delaware River and its effect on wild life in the area, because of this work. However, the Chief of Engineers has pointed out that the tidal flows in the existing canal, return more water to the river, than they draw from it, and there is little reason to believe that the condition would be reversed if the Canal were widened and deepened. He has also assured us that the improvements are not expected to have any adverse effect on the quality of water in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries.

With the increasing use of larger vessels, improvement of our navigation program is necessary. The use of the larger vessels in transportation, will mean greater economy, with its resultant lowered cost to the consumer.

Under the circumstances, while the improvements to the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal recommended in this bill, approved by the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, will be of great value to the people of Maryland, they will also prove of equally great benefit to the Nation as a whole, insofar as general commerce and the national defense are concerned. Therefore, I cannot too strongly urge the approval of this project by the House.

(Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9859 contains authorizations for two projects in my district which are exceedingly important to New Hampshire. For improvements in the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River there is an authorization of \$952,000. For the beach erosion project at Hampton Beach there is an authorization of \$140,000. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Committee on Public Works for including the river and harbor project and the beach erosion project in H. R. 9859. These projects are vital to the State of New Hampshire.

The New Hampshire coastline is short—just under 18 miles in length. On this coast we have one of the finest harbors in the East and one of the most popular beaches. Both are exceedingly important to the economic life of the State.

The harbor at Portsmouth never freezes. The channel in places is 70 feet deep and the shallowest points are about 40 feet deep. It is unfortunate, however, that in the harbor and the Piscataqua River there are rock obstructions. Their

removal to permit the entrance of larger boats would be a tremendous industrial stimulus not only to the immediate locality, but to the entire area.

As early as 1885 and 1886 reports were submitted to the Senate in Executive Document 44 of the 49th Congress. In 1916 reports were submitted to the 63d Congress on Portsmouth Harbor. These reports were for the purpose of determining the advisability of further improvements in the interest of navigation, including the removal of Gangway Rock and improvement work at the southwest point of Badgers Island. I refer briefly to these prior reports to point out that from 1916 to 1948 no action had been taken to bring about the improvements in the river and harbor. If the rock obstructions could be removed, New Hampshire would have an excellent deepwater port the year round.

REVIEW RESOLUTION—ENGINEERS' REPORT—
H. R. 4938

On December 22, 1948, I conducted a hearing in Portsmouth for the purpose of discussing the subject of harbor and river improvements. Convincing evidence that the proposed improvements would be worth while and were justified in view of the industrial development which would soon follow was presented. Early in 1949 I submitted the record of this hearing to the Public Works Committee of the House and on February 17, 1949, the committee adopted a resolution for a survey of the Federal project already in existence over many years. In June 1952 the Chief of Engineers submitted a report on the harbor and the river recommending the removal of the rock obstructions, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government.

On April 30, 1953, I introduced H. R. 4938, a bill to authorize funds in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. The Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Oregon, Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL, gave me an excellent hearing on July 17, 1953. Several witnesses appeared before the subcommittee testifying on the importance of the project. The facts presented clearly demonstrated that the improvements of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River by removal of the obstructions would result in widespread benefits to the economic life of New Hampshire. Such improvements will be of a permanent nature since there is no silting in the harbor.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
VISIT NEW HAMPSHIRE

I am happy that nine members of the Public Works Committee visited New Hampshire from August 28 to September 1, 1953. The mission, headed by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, made a thorough inspection of the harbor and the river. The Members also visited Rye Harbor, Hampton Harbor, and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. It is significant that for the first time in the history of the Granite State Members of Congress who are dealing with harbor and erosion problems have acquired a complete picture of all the prob-

lems connected with the New Hampshire harbors and coastline.

On May 26 the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors approved an authorization of \$952,000 for Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River to be included in this bill we are considering today. I am more than pleased that the full committee on June 11 included this in H. R. 9859, which is now before us for action.

INDUSTRIAL FUTURE

The extent of the economic and industrial development as a result of such improvements will be boundless. The clearing of Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River will be one of the greatest boons to economic growth New Hampshire has ever experienced. We are now in sight of the long-needed and long-overdue harbor and river improvements.

HAMPTON BEACH AND HAMPTON HARBOR BEACH
EROSION

Hampton Beach is one of New Hampshire's greatest assets. Prior to 1935 Hampton Beach was subject to grave erosion and considerable property damage due to the fluctuation of the inlet to Hampton Harbor. In 1932 the beach erosion board made a report which resulted in 1935 in the building of jetties by the State of New Hampshire. Sand was pumped from the harbor and about 50 acres of land were reclaimed. In 1942, as a result of a further erosion study, the State constructed a seawall.

On many occasions I have inspected the beach and have been much alarmed by the constant erosion. It is disturbing to see one of New Hampshire's greatest assets being washed away. I have constantly sought action to correct this situation.

In a letter to me dated August 14, 1952, Col. L. H. Hewitt, of the division of engineers, stated:

I have just received word from the Office of the Chief of Engineers that the New England division is authorized to proceed with the cooperative beach erosion study at Hampton Beach, N. H., which was suspended under Presidential directive dated July 21, 1950, as an economy measure.

STATE ACTION

This cooperative beach erosion study proceeded and in October 1953 it was submitted by the New England division for action by the Congress. The report recommends widening 1 mile of beach by 150 feet and the northerly quarter mile by an additional 25 feet. This would require 340,000 cubic yards of sand. The sand is available in the harbor lying immediately south of the beach. This project is to cost \$420,000 and the Federal participation, which is one-third, is \$140,000. I am glad that this is included in this bill.

In the 1953 session of the State legislature, New Hampshire authorized \$1,275,000 to carry on a program for the improvement of the shore at Hampton. The State proposes to extend the seawall and to improve the shore north and south of Great Boar's Head. The Federal grant is extremely important. The area is a vital unit in the economy of the State. Business at Hampton Beach totals approximately \$10 million annually.

ADOPTION OF EROSION PROJECT

On April 7, 1954, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors held a hearing on the erosion project, and on May 26, 1954, approved the project. On June 15, 1954, the full committee included the project in the bill we are considering today.

Early in 1949 I requested the Public Works Committee of the House to review the reports on Hampton Beach and Hampton Harbor. In June 2, 1949, the committee passed the following resolution:

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on Hampton River and Harbor, N. H., submitted in House Document No. 247, 58th Congress, 2d session, and subsequent reports with a view to determining whether the provision of anchorage basins and channel and other improvements for navigation is advisable at this time.

Although the above resolution is still pending, the Corps of Engineers under the provisions of section 2 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, which was approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, made a study of Hampton Beach as I have just described.

I have already pointed out that the sand to be used for the beach will be taken from the harbor. Therefore, as soon as the authorization of \$140,000 is completed by the Congress and the appropriation is made, not only will the erosion work be carried out, but the harbor will be dredged.

IMPORTANCE OF BEACH EROSION PROJECT

I cannot stress too strongly the importance of this work. The town of Hampton has a population of nearly 3,000, but within a radius of 50 miles there are 2,350,000. This is a most popular area. Hampton Beach and Hampton Harbor form the center of the recreational needs for thousands of people. Therefore, the improvements about which I have been speaking will affect in a very material way the economy of the entire area.

CONCLUSION

The people of my district are exceedingly happy that these two projects have been included in this bill. I take this opportunity to thank the committee for the consideration they have given New Hampshire and I am more than pleased that so much progress had been made toward the accomplishment of these long-range improvements which will mean so much to the economy of the Granite State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to pay my respects to each and every member of this committee. However, I cannot go along with them in respect to all of the legislation they have submitted.

I observe that almost all States in the Union are pretty well taken care of by way of projects of various kinds. I understand 41 States are included in this proposal. I want to ask the chairman of this committee, whether or not this bill will cost almost a billion dollars, so when

you pass the bill you are going to obligate our country by almost one billion dollars in additional charges—\$897 million is the amount I read in your report.

I also direct your attention to the fact that our country is charged with projects amounting to some ten billion dollars, according to the figures I have before me. I regret I do not have all the information, because with all that is said about this, copies of hearings on flood control are not available.

I would like to know, however, how many projects there are already authorized but not completed. Can any member of the committee give me that information?

Mr. DONDERO. They amount to some \$10 million.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman know the number of them?

Mr. DONDERO. No; I do not.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am getting at is, why should we go ahead and authorize billions of dollars on new projects when we have not already started on projects that have been authorized. If these projects authorized in this bill are more imminent or more important, then such showing should be made. In other words, if these, or any of them, should have priority then why not indicate it. It is probable that some of the projects ought to have immediate attention. If such is true then set them out so they must have first attention. Furthermore, many of these projects are to provide complete flood protection or to furnish water supply for cities and towns at the expense of the Government. What do cities and towns who furnish a part, or all, of the funds for water supply think about that? These are two items, in my opinion, should be eliminated from this bill. They are described as the Pomona Reservoir and the Melvern Reservoir, and are, if built, to be located in Osage County, Kans.

They are at the head of a series of nine dams, or reservoirs, on a comparatively small river. It is the Marias Des Cygnes River in Kansas. Then it is the Osage River in Missouri.

Let me make this quite clear. This is not a part of the Kaw or Kansas River. It does not flow into the Missouri River near Kansas City. It has nothing to do with the Kansas City flood you hear so much about. It flows into the Missouri River near Jefferson City. It will be said that these projects should be built to prevent a disaster—if there is a disaster—similar to that of 1951. Army engineers have testified, in event of a repetition of that conflagration, neither of the proposed dams, or both of them, would protect the city from damaging floods. How could they, when they are full or nearly full of water, if and when such flood could come.

I do agree the reservoir at Melvern would furnish a good supply of water for the city right below the dam.

It would lend some Government protection to property owners, protection at the expense of owners of lands and homes that would be put under water by reason of this legislation.

There is a program of watersheds going on, whereby they are working on the problem of holding the water where it falls. They are working on the problem of putting in a series of small dams on this river or creek, and it would save the expenditure of tremendous amounts of money; and would save not only the expenditure of money but thousands of acres of good productive land that would be put under water.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize my distinguished friend from just east of our district, who represents the town of Ottawa, is in favor of this because it will protect the city of Ottawa. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States will supply funds in the sum of \$26 million if this dam is completed, and it will provide 2 things for that city. It will provide water supply and possibly it will help the control of floods in some degree. The gentleman and I differ a little on that, because I think there is another way of taking care of the flood-control situation in the town he describes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. First I would like to ask the gentleman if he favors the projects on the Marias des Cygnes River.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not at this time. At least not while there is a watershed program underway.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Which will protect his hometown of Emporia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Emporia is not on the Marias des Cygnes River.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would also like to ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the Marias des Cygnes Valley about which we are talking is not a valley where you have a flood just once in a while but a valley where we have floods almost every year and that will happen almost any minute of the year and do tremendous damage clear down the stream.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I don't think the floods are as frequent as the gentleman describes. If he is talking about flash floods then it is difficult for any dams to stop them.

I do think, as a matter of fairness, these people—hundreds of them ought to be given a chance to go ahead with their watershed plans whereby they can protect their soil, catch most of the rain where it falls, and hold the surplus in comparatively small reservoirs rather than do it in this way. The thing that impresses me is the efforts the property owners are making in dealing with this problem. Out of respect to these people, the least you should do is to give them a chance to develop these plans under legislation recently approved by this Congress, sponsored by the House Committee on Agriculture. Do not forget you are disturbing the homes and lives of thousands of good American citizens

if you put this legislation into effect. Let me repeat. I am not talking about other projects. I am talking about a situation different from others.

One thing more. I do not believe the testimony is overwhelming that the plan is economically sound. Of course, it will make land below the dam more valuable. Is that the complete answer?

I suggest we withhold the spending of \$50 million until these home owners have been given a chance to try to work this problem out. Let me remind you once more that 4,000 American citizens who would be affected, are asking you not to authorize this legislation at the present time. The thing I want the members to understand is that while these people are now putting in a watershed plan, we can let this thing go over for a year or two, and give them a chance.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have been waiting for 25 years. The gentleman talks about 4,000 signers on a petition. I will show him 12,000 signers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, because they get all the benefits and do not have to pay anything for such benefits. I understand that. But here are people whose land will be used and those people will be damaged if you approve this legislation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They will be paid, but when we lose it we pay for it ourselves.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not think the Government ought to pay all of those benefits. If the gentleman believes the Government should pay for all of these things, I cannot agree with him.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I take this time primarily to explain an amendment to the bill that I intend to offer when the bill is read for amendment. The amendment I propose would not be brought to the floor at this time if we had had an opportunity to act upon it in committee, but by agreement in committee it was decided to hold this amendment out until we came to the floor because at the time we did not have a complete report. As a matter of fact, we do not have one yet in regard to it. So I think it is time to pass upon the proposition.

Mr. Chairman, the many reservoirs that have been built over the country by the Corps of Engineers in the last 20 years or so have been one of the greatest recreational assets that the United States today enjoys. May I point out that last year 51 million people visited these various reservoirs over the United States for hunting, fishing, boating, and other types of recreation which are available at a lake. Most of these lakes, these man-made lakes, that have been constructed at public expense, primarily, of course, for flood-control purposes, are

in areas where there never has been this type of recreational facilities before. The people have learned to enjoy them and receive a great deal of benefit from these areas. I know something about this personally because we have three such lakes built in northern Mississippi where I happen to live, and I know how greatly the people in that area make use of these lakes for hunting and fishing.

Under the policy that has been established by the Corps of Engineers in the past the land around the lakes has been made available for rent or lease at nominal sums to various States and to various local nonprofit organizations, such as the Boy Scouts, the 4-H Clubs, and so forth, to organize camps and to make use of the area for recreational purposes. A good part of the area is leased to commercial operators who rent cabins and various fishing and hunting equipment, or sell it in order to give the public greater access to these recreational areas.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, 51 million people during the past year made use of this great recreational opportunity that has been made possible to the people of the country as a by-product of our flood-control program. All of the reservoirs that are authorized under this bill were studied and surveyed and reported to the Congress under the procedure which provided for certain acquisition that made recreational development possible.

NEW LAND POLICY

However, last fall the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior, the two agencies of the Government that manage the great reservoirs of our country, announced the adoption of a new land-acquisition policy which was designed for good purposes. I am sure, but which would have the effect, if it is allowed to continue without at least some indication of the sense of the Congress in this regard, of making impossible the future recreational development of these reservoirs as they have in the past. This new policy makes it impossible for the Corps of Engineers, in the case of the reservoirs authorized under this bill, to acquire land in a manner that will make possible these various State and local parks that have been established in the past, and the various access areas for the general public for fishing and hunting in these reservoir projects. The main difference is that the new policy provides that the Government shall buy floodway easements instead of buying outright title to certain land adjacent to a conservation pool. I am reliably informed by the people who do this work or who have watched it being done over a long period of years that there will be virtually no difference in the cost, and that is readily understandable. Certainly no farmer is going to sell a floodway easement on his property for any vast difference in amount of cost than he would to sell the land outright, because it is subject to flooding at all times under the floodway easement, without any recovery of damages to crops or property or anything like that, and land like that, of course, could never be sold in the future for any

amount worthy of any price. I am told in the areas that I am familiar with that the difference in cost would perhaps not be as much as 5 percent. Perhaps it would be as little as 1 percent in those matters. What I strive to do in the amendment that I shall introduce is to provide on a very permissive basis that land to be acquired to build the reservoirs authorized under this act, under the flood-control title of this act, shall be acquired in such a manner as to facilitate the potential development of recreational uses of the reservoir by Federal, State, or local authorities, whenever such recreational development would not interfere with the basic purposes of the reservoir.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed upon when it is offered at the time the bill is read for amendment, because I am certain it is not the sense of this Congress that it would desire these new manmade lakes which are being built under the authorization of this bill to be constructed in such a manner that the general public would be denied proper access for the recreational use of these lakes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Flood Control for their diligent attendance at all meeting of the committee. Also I thank them for their active participation in the hearings on these projects.

In behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, I, in compliance with his request, thank the members of his subcommittee for their diligence and interest during the consideration of the rivers and harbors section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, I am happy to recommend this bill to the Members of the House. It is, in my opinion, a good bill.

More hours of study and research, I think, were devoted by members of the Public Works Committee to the preparation of this bill than to any river-and-harbor and flood-control measure ever reported by the committee. Every project in the bill has been scrutinized with the greatest care. I do not believe there is anything in the bill that should not be there.

Every project in this bill has the approval of the United States Army engineers of the district and division in which the proposed project originated.

When the district and divisional engineers approve a river-and-harbor or flood-control project their favorable report is sent to the Board of Army Engineers here in Washington for review and reexamination. This Board of Review, composed of the ablest and most experienced division engineers of the Nation, reexamined the project. Every project in this bill has been reexamined by this distinguished Board of Army En-

gineers and has this Review Board's approval.

Every project in this bill has been reviewed and approved by the Secretary of the Army.

Every project in this bill has been approved by the governor of the State in which it will be constructed.

With a very few exceptions, all projects in this bill have the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors or of the Committee on Flood Control, whichever held the hearings on the project. In a few cases projects were included in the bill where one or two members voted against the project. In these few cases, however, a large majority of our committee favored the projects.

Every project upon which hearings were held which is not included in this bill was left out by the unanimous or practically unanimous approval of the committee.

Every project that was modified by reducing the monetary authorization asked by the Army engineers was so reduced by the unanimous vote of the committee.

In short, this bill as finally written expressed the almost unanimous view of the committee and is just about the nearest approach to complete agreement that anyone could expect on a bill of this magnitude and complexity.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS HIGH

There is no project in this bill that does not have a benefit cost ratio of better than unity—that is, of \$1 of benefit a year for each dollar of annual cost as computed by the Corps of United States Army Engineers. In many cases the benefits are better, \$2 to \$3 to each \$1 of cost and in some as high as \$6 a year in benefits to each \$1 of annual cost.

The dollars spent on the flood-control projects in this bill should not be considered as expenditures but rather as investments which will pay for themselves within a period of years.

America's great source of strength is her matchless productive machine which has demonstrated that it can, in peace or war, outproduce the world. One reason for the strength of that productive machine is our best-in-the-world transportation system, which enables us to get raw material to factories and finished goods to consumers quickly and cheaply.

Despite the developments in air, railroad, and motor transportation, waterways do now, as since the beginning of civilization, provide the lowest cost transportation for bulk cargoes. We must keep our rivers and harbors, which are the highways for low-cost cargo shipments, in good condition in order that freight charges may be kept low. Whatever reduces transportation costs in the end reduces consumer prices.

It is of historic interest to note that nearly all great industrial cities always have been established where low-cost water transportation has been available.

The world's first great cities, when boats were frail, developed in river valleys, such as the Nile and Euphrates.

Later when boats became larger, great cities developed on the inland seas such as the Mediterranean. Then Carthage, Rome, and Athens came into their glory. Afterward, when vessels became sea-

worthy, industry and civilization moved to the oceans and seacoasts and thenceforth until now the great population centers are on ports where rail and water transportation meet.

It is interesting to note that in our own country, not until we reach our 16th city in size, Indianapolis, Ind., do we find a big city that is not an ocean, a lake, or a river port.

The great river systems of America, for the most part and at most times, have been kind to the American people. However, these rivers do have a Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde character and do suffer periods of madness when they run amuck leaving death, destruction, and disaster in their wake.

Since 1936, when the first general flood-control act was passed, Congress has been trying to bring the river systems of the Nation under control.

Floods are not new in America. De Soto encountered them when he first, in 1541, visited the interior of our continent. New Englanders were building dikes to fight floods long before they built ramparts on Bunker Hill to fight the British. Southern farmers were constructing similar works to battle the oncoming waters of the Mississippi long before the Louisiana Purchase.

The floods of pioneer days, however, did little damage if damages be measured in dollars. The river valleys then were only sparsely settled. These valleys were not crowded, then, as they are today with cities, factories, office buildings, churches, schools, highways, bridges, railroads, and developed farmlands.

Even when early-day floods washed fertile farmlands downstream to the sea, pioneer farmers worried little for over the hill was more land, untouched by the plow, that could be had almost for the asking.

Times, however, have changed. Good idle farmland is scarce and becoming scarcer. The river valleys have become heavily populated and are becoming more so every year. Billions have been invested in the river valleys for buildings, highways, railroads, and those improvements which civilization requires. These investments are increasing year after year. The urgency of protecting the increasing number of valley residents and their mounting investments is growing and will continue to grow as long as the population continues to multiply and prosper.

The Corps of the United States Army Engineers has made studies during recent years which reveal that the average monetary loss which this Nation suffers from floods is about \$500 million a year. Some years, such as 1936 when New England experienced a flood that did a half billion in damage and 1951 in which the billion-dollar flood occurred in the Missouri and Kaw basins, the damages have far exceeded the half-billion dollar average. In other favorable years the losses have been less. But on the average, say the Army engineers, the flood loss of the Nation is half a billion dollars a year.

These losses will tend to increase, rather than decrease, unless strong remedial works are undertaken.

Our Nation in 1900 had a population of less than 75 million. By 1950 our Nation's population had increased to more than 150 million. Our population will be 300 million by A. D. 2000.

Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the population of this Nation by A. D. 2000 will double. It probably will be 300 million then compared to half that number now.

The doubling of our Nation's population by the year A. D. 2000 will mean more people and more wealth in our river valleys to require flood protection.

The sooner Congress provides that protection the less it will cost since nearly all protective works demand land acquisition, and land values increase in ratio with population growth.

Flood control in America was once a small and simple problem. The expanding populations and growing wealth of our Nation's river valleys have made it a complex and gigantic one.

It was not until 1936 that Congress, after years of urging recognized flood control as a national welfare responsibility of the Federal Government and made it so in the Flood Control Act of 1936.

In the 18 years which have elapsed since the enactment of that first flood-control bill, the Congress has authorized the construction of 909 flood-control projects. These 909 Federal flood-control projects if all constructed at today's prices would require the expenditure of \$6,736,000,000 of Federal funds.

Of this huge sum \$2,286,000,000 already has been appropriated, leaving nearly \$5 billion still to be appropriated before these 909 authorized projects can be completed.

Nor will the completion of these 909 authorized projects finish the Nation's flood-control problems for there are today 446 proposed flood-control projects not yet authorized that are in the study mill of the United States Army Engineers. Most of these, eventually, will come to the Congress for authorizations.

Three years ago the Jones committee of which our friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], was chairman, did an excellent job studying the Nation's water problems. Among facts developed by the Jones committee was one which showed that the backlog of authorized river and harbor flood-control projects at that time was \$10 billion.

Since then, the Congress have appropriated \$1½ billion for river and harbor and flood-control works. This was reduced the backlog to \$8½ billion. Also, the Corps of United States Army Engineers has prepared a list of projects, estimated to cost \$2 billion, and placed these projects on a deferred list. This has reduced the backlog to about \$6½ billion now. When this bill is passed the backlog of authorized projects will be about \$7½ billion.

I am not alarmed by this backlog. I think this backlog a good thing. We should have a great many thoroughly investigated worthy projects ready for instant use if and when a recession or depression should occur.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to get this clear: After the Congress authorized this \$10 billion, did the Army engineers shove \$2 billion of it aside?

Mr. MACK of Washington. No. They have taken \$2 billion of projects and placed them on an inactive list. Projects on the inactive list will not be considered until all other projects have been undertaken.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But they are still authorized?

Mr. MACK of Washington. They are still authorized, but they are on the inactive list.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We did not strike them clear out?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Regarding the Little Sioux project in Iowa, I note the committee has approved an additional authorization of \$10,076,000 for that project, which is in addition to the original authorization in 1948, I believe. The original project was estimated by the Army engineers to cost \$5,390,000. As I understand, the purpose of the committee was to bring the total authorization on that project up to the request of the Army engineers of \$15,466,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee that handled this, the gentleman who now has the floor, if my assumption is correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct. The Army engineers requested \$15,466,000. The committee cut down their request for an appropriation but specified they were to use the money unexpended in the old authorization to make up the difference. In effect you get the full amount as requested by the Army engineers to fully complete and develop the project as recommended in the report of the Army engineers.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I, too, want to pay a compliment to the two subcommittees and the full committee, possibly, for the hard work they have done on this particular legislation. Though a member of the Committee on Public Works, it is not my privilege to sit on either the Subcommittee on Flood Control or the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors; however, I know the members of those subcommittees have put in a great deal of hard work.

May I ask the distinguished chairman if he will explain to the committee this language appearing on page 39, line 25:

That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as required, from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations.

And so forth. In other words, in this legislation are we giving a blank check to the Army engineers to establish where and when they want to this network of stations without any further consideration relative to the cost?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the chairman of the full committee desire to answer that question, or does he desire I do so?

Mr. DONDERO. That is a matter of cooperation between the Army engineers and the Weather Bureau in establishing stations throughout the country. No, it does not. It is simply carrying on the practice and custom that has heretofore obtained. By doing this, it is really a matter of economy and cutting down the cost.

Mr. MCGREGOR. In line 25 it says, "That there is hereby authorized an expenditure." We have no idea what that expenditure is going to be. Is that correct? It is a blanket authorization, with no dollars and cents established by an authorization as such.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army engineers have greatly expanded their programs of flood control. Of course, they must have weather reports in order to carry out these flood-control projects effectively. Up to the present time the Army engineers have been expending about \$375,000 a year to finance these weather reports from the Weather Bureau. The engineers figure they should pay the Weather Bureau more than that. It is estimated that perhaps the cost will be as much as \$1 million a year.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is it not possible to put a limit on the amount of money they can spend? You are giving them an unlimited authorization here.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee felt that the Army engineers would not waste this money since it is money that is allocated for the construction of projects, that will be used to secure these weather reports. We think the engineers will use the money judiciously because they are not going to turn any more money over to the Weather Bureau than they feel they have to have.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe that is fully explained on page 157 of the report. The amount of money that has been involved is \$375,000.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I agree with the distinguished chairman that it is in the report, but in the bill that we are going to pass and which will become law, you are giving a blank check for it.

Mr. JENSEN. The Army engineers are limited on each project as to the amount of money that can be spent on the projects. When the Congress appropriates for these projects, whatever the Army engineers would spend for weather reports would have to be taken out of the amount of money which the Congress appropriates for the projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. So there is a limitation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. But I still call to your attention the fact that you are amending the Flood Control Act of 1938, which you referred to, and giving an authorization for the expenditure of an

unknown amount of money for these weather projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I think the gentleman from Iowa is correct. I do not believe the Army engineers are going to waste \$1 million by taking it away from constructive projects and needlessly paying it over to another agency of the Government, namely, the Weather Bureau.

Mr. DONDERO. The explanation is on page 40 of the bill. The explanation is in the legislation. With reference to the amount which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] refers to as being a blank check, you will notice that the bill reads "from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control on rivers and harbors." In other words, they can switch the amount they need from one agency to the other, whichever seems most desirable and in the interest of economy.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is the part I am objecting to, because you are giving the Army engineers an opportunity and the right to take money from an appropriation which might be used for dredging and put it into a Weather Bureau program. That is the part I am objecting to.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, no cost figures are available on the magnitude of the Nation's water resources development problems. My guess is—and I consider it a most conservative one—that it will require the expenditure of \$20 billion to assure full protection of our river valleys from floods and to assure that the waters of our rivers will be used to the best advantage for the related purposes of navigation, reclamation, irrigation, recreation, and power production.

The taxpayers will pay for these water development projects whether these are built or not. If these flood control, and other water development projects, are built, our citizens will pay for them in taxes. If these projects are not built, the taxpayers will pay for them just the same, in the half billion dollars a year they will be compelled to spend to repair the damages of the floods which will repeatedly occur if protection works are not provided; in the loss of the use of low-cost power and in higher transportation costs of freight for which low-cost water transportation is not made available.

Since it will cost less to build these water development projects now than later when population growth has swollen land values, we of the Congress should move forward to providing funds for protective works as rapidly as the budgetary reduction of the Nation permits.

Flood-control measures save property from damage and destruction. The money spent on flood control is repaid by the saving of property from destruction.

The money spent on flood-control projects is not all outgo. Many of the flood-control projects are multiple purpose ones. Some of these projects in addition to preventing flood damage generate hydroelectric power. These power revenues often go a long way toward helping to pay the cost of building a flood-control reservoir or dam. For ex-

ample, it is figured that the flood-control Dalles Dam, when completed, will return to the Federal Government, at present rates, \$11,800,000 a year in power revenue.

The Bonneville Power Administration, which markets the power from Federal dams on the Columbia River, during the past year paid into the Federal Treasury more than \$50 million. This \$50 million was more than enough to pay all of the operating and maintenance expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration, with enough left over to return to the Federal Government all of the money our Government has invested in Columbia River flood control and power dams, plus interest on the money.

The great flood control and power dams have created behind them great lakes which have added much in many regions to the recreational enjoyments of the people.

Also, in many cases these dams have helped to provide the people in populous cities with a better and more wholesome supply of domestic water.

Despite our zeal for river and harbor and flood-control improvements, we, Congressmen, must ever keep in mind that we must maintain the Nation's strong national financial and economic system by guarding it against the inflation that results from overly large deficit spending and a national debt that is too colossal. It is, therefore, necessary that we first economize in some places that we may expand our spending efforts in other and more worthwhile ones.

President Eisenhower has been doing a great job of eliminating waste and extravagance from Government. As his program for economy and efficiency in Government goes forward there will be more money for two things: First, for tax reduction to the people; and second, for undertaking and expanding programs for such worthwhile and necessary improvement of lasting benefit such as the building of more, better, and safer highways and more river and harbor, flood control, and water resources development works.

Solution of the Nation's water problems, its flood control, navigation, power-dam building, reclamation, and irrigation is a gigantic undertaking that will cost at a most conservative estimate at least \$20 billion.

It is not wise that our citizens should expect and depend solely upon Uncle Sam, alone, to do it all. We should approve and applaud, therefore, the President's proposal for partnership development of the water resources.

Our highways today are being built under a partnership arrangement between the States and the Federal Government. It is just as desirable that our water resources developments should go forward with the States and local communities assisting wherever they can. Projects will go forward much faster under partnership than by expecting Uncle Sam, alone, to do it all.

The Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has reported favorably and the House already has passed two important flood-control bills which will permit 2 State publicly owned Oregon-Washington utilities to build 2

hydroelectric dams in the Pacific Northwest. The building of these dams under the partnership arrangement will free more than \$350 million of Federal money for use on other water developments.

One thing the Congress should guard against in building these huge water development projects is the taking of unnecessarily large blocks of land into Federal ownership and off the local tax rolls of States and their subdivisions.

For example, at the Falcom Dam in Texas the Government bought 47,000 acres of land above the highest point to which water behind the dam would ever rise. This 47,000 acres was to be used for recreational purposes. While almost everyone is for recreation, the taking of 47,000 acres at this one location for recreation was an extravagant waste of taxpayers' money. That much land never will be needed there for recreation.

In most cases the Federal Government, except in the national park field, should not be in the recreation business and acquire large land holdings for that purpose. The recreation field usually is one for the States. The States are in far better position to say how much land is required for recreational purpose than is the faraway Government here in Washington.

Everywhere throughout the Nation the Federal Government is holding many small parcels of land for which it no longer has any use. These should be sold to the States, subdivisions of the States, or to private citizens and thereby put to useful purposes and gotten back onto the tax rolls.

Instead of constantly increasing its land holding the Federal Government should be reducing these holdings.

Of the entire land area of all the 48 States in the Union, 23.89 percent is owned, controlled, managed, and administered by the Federal Government. The land owned by the Federal Government in the 48 States, if consolidated into one block, would be sufficient to create a State $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the size of Texas or 10 times the size of the State of Washington.

The total land area of these 48 States is 2,977,138 square miles. Of this, the Federal Government owns 711,166 square miles, or 455,146,725 acres. These Federal land holdings are the equivalent of more than 3 acres for every man, woman, and child who live in the United States. And these figures, mind you, do not include the additional enormous land holdings of the Federal Government in Alaska, Hawaii, and elsewhere outside continental United States.

Of the entire area of the 10 Western States, 54.31 percent, or considerably more than one-half, is federally owned. Under leave, I include a table showing the land area, in acres, of each of the 10 Western States, the number of these acres which are owned by the Federal Government, and the percentage of the State's whole acreage that this Federal ownership comprises.

Federal landownership

	Total land area of State	Acreage in Federal ownership	Percentage of Federal ownership
Washington.....	42,865,280	14,998,067	34.99
Oregon.....	61,664,000	32,510,870	52.72
California.....	100,353,920	45,900,157	45.74
Arizona.....	72,691,200	50,471,920	69.43
New Mexico.....	77,767,040	35,479,713	45.62
Nevada.....	70,273,280	59,526,959	84.71
Idaho.....	52,997,120	34,285,000	64.69
Montana.....	93,642,240	34,213,875	36.54
Utah.....	52,701,440	37,592,044	71.33
Colorado.....	66,538,880	24,851,005	37.35

There are 149 projects in this bill. These projects are in 41 States and 2 Territories. Every one of them has the approval of this committee.

Some projects upon which the committee held hearings were rejected, most of them by a unanimous or almost unanimous vote.

One project involved flood-control protection for a golf course. It was a municipal golf course. The committee, however, felt that we should not spend taxpayers' money on projects of this kind. The committee held it was not a Federal responsibility to provide flood protection for a municipal golf course.

Several other projects were rejected by the committee because the cost of protecting the land was too great compared to the value of the land.

Although the bill has in it 149 projects the total amount of money authorizations involved is less than \$900 million. It will be 2 years before another bill of this kind is enacted.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the committee on the proposed bill. I think it is one that was very thoroughly considered and very well worked out. I am particularly pleased that the committee has authorized the necessary funds to prevent what, in my opinion, would be a major disaster to our Nation, and that is the diversion of the Mississippi River into a new channel whereby it would flow to the Gulf of Mexico in a way different from that which it now flows.

The committee, in its wisdom, recognizing the vital national significance of keeping the Mississippi River where it is, has made the necessary authorization, and I am quite sure that this means that Ol' Man River will keep on flowing past New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico.

I should like particularly to address my remarks to that section of the bill providing for the authorization of approximately \$47 million for the erection of control structures and other works to prevent the diversion of the Mississippi River at Old River in Louisiana.

It is vital that the work begin on this project as soon as practicable. Failure to adopt this authorization and later to

appropriate the necessary funds would be a disaster of the first order.

This is a matter of the most extreme urgency. It is not only absolutely necessary that something be done; it is imperative that it be done, or at least that it be commenced immediately.

Each year more and more of the water of the Mississippi River is being diverted through Old River into the Atchafalaya River. In 1919, the percentage of this diversion was 17.1 percent. By 1950, it had reached 30 percent. The best and most reliable estimates are that it will reach 40 percent before 1965. If this should come to pass, we will have waited too long, because when this point is reached, nothing can be done. The history of diversions from one channel to another teaches us that as the rate increases the speed increases. The channel widens and deepens at such a terrific rate that it eventually becomes impossible to reverse the flow. This is the considered opinion of sound, level-headed engineers who speak from actual experience.

Old River has doubled in size since 1894 and, since 1942, its flow has been into the Atchafalaya exclusively instead of back and forth between the Atchafalaya and the Mississippi, as was the case in former years. If this steady diversion is allowed to continue uninterrupted much longer, the Atchafalaya will capture the Mississippi and no power on earth will be able to prevent it.

Now this does not mean that there will be 2 channels, with 1 going this way and the other that. The inexorable laws of nature operate in a different way from this. Instead of a fork, there will be a complete cutoff. Eddies will be built up by the swirling waters and silt deposited in the old channel until eventually a natural dam will have been built and all the water that formerly flowed down the Mississippi will be carried by the Atchafalaya with consequences almost too appalling to contemplate.

The fact that this hour is only now upon us is due to the fact that nature has been kind to us in recent years and no unusual circumstances have intervened to increase our peril. But let a series of floods occur and the diversion we contemplate will occur by 1965 may take place much sooner. We will then find ourselves in the frustrating position, after having spent hundreds of millions of dollars for flood control, of having allowed a disaster of the most devastating magnitude to develop while we debated the advisability of taking this obviously necessary precautionary measure.

Scores of major industrial facilities line the banks of the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico. Included among these are the largest complete products oil refinery in the world and the greatest aluminum-production facility in America. Five oil refineries process a total of 340,000 barrels of crude oil a day, and on the lower Mississippi River giant sulfur works supply

the basic ingredient of that most important product, sulfuric acid, a commodity so vital to our civilization that it has been said that a nation's industrial progress can be measured by its consumption. It is agreed, incidentally, that without these sulfur deposits on the Mississippi River and the means of making them produce America would face a most critical sulfur shortage.

In addition to oil refineries, aluminum plants, and sulfur works, there are match factories, chemical plants, cordage works, sugar houses, and ammunition facilities. There are plants that produce rubber, building materials, asbestos shingles, plumbing fixtures, board and plywood products, yeast, and tank engines. There are steel mills, cement plants, powerhouses, and other industries too numerous to mention, and they have all one basic requirement in common. They all need vast amounts of fresh water to operate. At present they are getting their water from the Mississippi, but what will happen when the Mississippi River becomes a salt-water arm of the Gulf of Mexico? I sincerely hope we never find out.

Tremendous as they are, the things that I have mentioned are only a few of the consequences that would follow a change of course by the Mississippi River. They are in themselves, however, certainly sufficient to convince anyone that this terrible thing must not happen.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for this time for the purpose of opposing this legislation. My record in the Congress has been in support of flood-control programs. I certainly have no intention of saying anything that would add to the apparent civil war in Kansas.

In looking over these projects, I notice there are projects in 41 of the 48 States, but West Virginia happens to be 1 of the 7 States not included. That is due to the fact that West Virginia did not ask for any more authorizations. We were active right after the authorization by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1938 in trying to get some of these projects, then authorized, activated.

In 1946, my first year in the Congress of the United States, we received an initial appropriation for the Sutton Reservoir. That is what I want to take time to advise my colleagues about this afternoon.

The Army engineers have an ambitious program for the control of floods. Since the Ohio River is one in which we have considerable rainfall, it is one in which they are conducting an ambitious program for flood control. In laying out the plan for the control of the great Kanawha River, which is one of the larger tributaries of the Ohio River, they designated four major projects in the State of West Virginia. Two or 3 years ago we finished construction of the famous Bluestone Dam on the New River in West Virginia. That is 1 of the 4 projects to control that watershed.

The second project is the reservoir at Sutton, W. Va., on the Elk River. The

third project is at Sommerville on the Gauley River, and the fourth one is at Big Bend on the Greenbrier, all tributaries of the Ohio River.

This Sutton project was initially authorized in 1946 in an initial appropriation of \$750,000. There have been additional appropriations to a total of \$3,100,000. We have acquired title to most of the property that will be flooded by this reservoir. We have relocated approximately 4½ miles of the main line of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. There are approximately 3 miles more of the railroad to be relocated. We had everything ready to start construction in 1951 and there was \$1,300,000 of construction money appropriated. The Korean trouble came on and President Truman froze this \$1,300,000 in the defense effort, on the ground that possibly we could not sustain a claim that this project was in the interest of national defense.

Despite the action of the President, the Army engineers in approving this project said that if we had one flood similar to the one we have had in the last 50 years in this valley, it would do \$20 million worth of damage to the Carbide & Carbon Co. installation on Blaine Island, where this project on Elk River is located, joins the great Kanawha River at the city of Charleston.

Just last Tuesday a group of businessmen from Charleston came to Washington and we had a conference with the Budget Office with reference to this particular project. Here is the main reason why there is a possibility that work can be resumed on this project. On the Elk River, on which this big reservoir is located, are located two eastern termini of the Big Inch pipeline. The John Cornwall station of the Hope Gas Co., and the Cobb station of the United Fuel & Gas. They are compressor stations that force gas to Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, and all points in the East. Within the last 20 years there have been floods that have damaged this John Cornwall station in the amount of \$6 million.

I am asking my colleagues of the Congress to imagine what situation would exist if we do not go ahead and construct this reservoir and afford flood protection to those two great compressor stations. What is going to happen to the distribution of natural gas in all the eastern section of the country if there is a flood?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. If this reservoir is not constructed, you will have at the mercy of the elements those two great facilities that supply fuel to the greater part of the eastern United States. They are both in the flood area, and the representatives of the companies concerned were before the Budget Bureau in an effort to get an appropriation for the project. We are hopeful that action can be had. If I were going to offer any objection to this legislation, it would be to the point made by the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]

when he said that the Army engineers had adopted a new policy of shoving back and putting on the shelf a lot of projects that had already been authorized in favor of certain of these new projects.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Army engineers have made a list of projects that will be the last ones they will recommend to the Bureau of the Budget to be put on the back shelf. These are not pressing and important projects. They have submitted a list of these projects to the Public Works Committee showing which ones are on the back shelf.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman will agree with me that a project like the reservoir of which I am talking that has to do with the fuel supply of one-fourth of the Nation is not going to be shoved on a back shelf in favor of one of the new projects in this bill?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not think so. The gentleman's project will be eligible for an appropriation any time he can sell the Appropriations Committee on the idea that money should be appropriated to start his project.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H. R. 9859.

For the first time in my nearly 18 years in Congress the House is acting on an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood-control bill in which the Third District of Michigan has a direct interest.

The proposed authorization of a flood-control project on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Mich., undertakes to bring to fruition 7 years of joint effort and study by the Army Corps of Engineers, the city of Battle Creek, and the State of Michigan. This proposed authorization offers prospect of solution of a flood problem of more than 50 years' duration, and, at the same time, provides the key to solution of other related community problems, including a major railroad-consolidation project.

I will not attempt to detail the facts or anticipated costs or savings incident to this flood-control program. They have been exhaustively summarized by the Corps of Engineers, and as exhaustively reviewed by the Public Works Subcommittee and the full committee.

I will mention only one fact, namely, that under this project the city of Battle Creek will assume 44 percent of the total cost of the program. This is an exceptionally high proportion of local participation and support and is striking evidence of the good faith of the community and of the earnest desire of the city to meet and solve a very serious flood-control problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would be completely remiss if I failed to acknowledge the painstaking and highly competent work of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of the

gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], and the Public Works Committee, under the chairmanship of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The caliber of the work done by these agencies of the executive branch and the committees of the Congress in respect to the project in which I have a special interest, and of which I therefore have a special awareness, has, I am sure, characterized their activities in respect to the other aspects of this omnibus bill. That is the best recommendation I know for approval of this bill.

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my compliments to the gentlemen who headed the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee and the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House. We held very lengthy hearings and I might say that the membership of each of the subcommittees were diligent in their work and stayed on the job listening to the testimony that came before us in justification of the many projects which appear in this bill. The committee took a nonpartisan position throughout our hearings. Each project was judged upon its merits.

In this bill today we have authorizations for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects of great importance to the internal economy of our country. When you take into consideration the hundreds of millions of dollars the taxpayers of the United States have paid out in public works throughout the entire world during the past several years, I believe it is about time that we start paying attention to the internal improvements of our own country. For instance, the smaller harbors, which may seem to be of little importance to many, are of vital importance to the fishing industry of our country; fishermen must go to sea to procure an important food for our people and should have the facility of safe harbors.

Many of the harbor improvements will be of great importance to those who use pleasure-type craft. In the improvement of these small harbors we are adding to the financial wealth of our country. In the improvement of the large harbors we are providing for economical transportation. We have long since established a policy to improve farm-to-market roads. I consider safe harbors for fishermen fall in the same category.

Flood-control projects approved by our committee and included in this bill will eliminate many of the flood losses that have occurred in the past. If we can avoid floods by proper treatment practices, untold millions will be saved. The losses by erosion is destroying untold acres of fine soil which must be saved for posterity. This bill will open up an avenue for internal improvements. It will be of great benefit to the United States of America and will provide for the ex-

penditure of tax money in our own country. I approve very thoroughly of the bill which we recommend to you today and trust it will be adopted.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the committee that this is a good bill, with two exceptions. There are a lot of committees that do not recommend these projects.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment to this bill is in the interest of all the people of the United States. Included in this \$73 million is an authorization for a dam at Perry, Kans., to cost \$16,263,000 and inundate 14,120 acres. I realize it is very unusual for a Member of the Congress to oppose the expenditure of Federal funds in his district, but the conditions under which I do so are most unusual. I am opposing the construction of these dams because the people of my district, where they are to be located, are opposed to them. This in itself should be sufficient reason for the passage of the amendment. The basis of their opposition further strengthens their position. In a few words this is why the people are opposed to these dams.

They oppose them because they are convinced that they are impractical and uneconomical. They are impractical because they are improperly placed and because they are antiquated. Let me picture to you what these proposed dams are intended to do. They are intended to protect the people living on the banks of the Kansas River against floods. Now where do floods come from? Evidently they do not arise from the water that falls on the river channel and the narrow valleys across which these dams are built. These channels are only a few rods wide. If it rained 40 days and 40 nights, as in Noah's time, on these valleys alone, it would not produce a flood. The river channel would take care of it. No, these floods come from the plains, the fields, and the farms that drain into these river channels. These fields and farms must be flooded before the channel can be flooded.

What is a flood, anyway? Why a flood is water on the rampage—water out of control. It must arise out of excess rainfall that the ground cannot absorb as it falls. Now it will be agreed that so far as the purpose of these proposed dams is concerned, our only problem is to take care of this excess or runoff water. Let us take a look at this problem, and in order to get the best possible perspective let us suppose we were up in an airplane during a heavy rain-storm when these floodwaters are formed. Let us look down upon this little valley of the Delaware River, one of the rivers these people want to dam. It is an area of 922 square miles upon which this rain is falling, 3, 4, 5, or maybe 6 inches of rainfall within as many hours. Only 1 or 2 inches can possibly soak into the soil. The rest, under the pull of gravity, is rushing by the shortest, steepest route to the ravines, the creeks, the tributaries, and on toward the river channel on its way to the sea. The

whole area is being flooded from the farms to the river channel. This river basin is one sheet of water.

Now, Mr. Chairman, plainly the only question is: What is the best method to control that sheet of water? Is it not the sensible thing to begin the remedy where the trouble begins? Does it make sense to permit these few inches of rainfall that are spread out over the fields to accumulate, multiply their force in the creeks and tributaries, and when it has been multiplied a thousandfold in the river channel to try to halt it there? Now, my colleagues, we have seen a flood in the making. That sheet of water that we see accumulating over that river basin of 922 square miles has the potentiality of doing a lot of good and a lot of harm. The part that sinks into the ground will produce crops and furnish water for wells and springs for the use of families and for livestock. The part that flows off is the part that causes us to worry. Left to nature it will rush toward the creeks, the rivers, and the sea by the shortest, swiftest route. Our problem is to direct its course, so to slow down its movement, as to minimize or even prevent any damage. This in recent years we have become able to do and with greatly accelerated speed we are doing it. This is our program of soil conservation and flood prevention.

It was the Congress of the United States that originated this program in the passage of the soil conservation and flood-prevention acts authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts in 1936, providing for the formation of pilot watershed projects in the 82d Congress and appropriating funds for this development in the first session of the 83d Congress, and for further and greatly increased development in this session.

Mr. Chairman, the program provided for by Congress is being rapidly put into operation and is proving effective beyond the expectations of its most ardent advocates. Mr. Chairman, here is a peculiar situation. In this very Delaware River Basin, where it is proposed to build this \$16 million dam, are located two of the experimental pilot watersheds. One of them is now nearing completion. A few weeks ago we had a torrential rain over that entire area, nearly 4 inches in a few hours. One dam was nearly completed and was one-half filled. It took 2½ days for the water to flow through the outlet. Had there been enough rainfall to fill the reservoir, it would have required 5½ days to drain the reservoir. Is it not plain that this system of slowing down the water where it falls and keeping it slowed down is the sensible way to prevent floods?

Bear in mind that this floodwater, unimpeded, does irreparable damage on every square rod of cultivated land before it even enters into the first ravine on its way to the sea. We must not let the water go unimpeded, carrying away our good soil, flooding our good creek bottoms, washing away our bridges, and then, after it has done all this great damage, try to stop it in the main channel. I hear it said that this plan is too complicated, will take too much time. The opposite is true. It would require

years to build the proposed dams on the rivers. During all that time, the people living on the river channel will have no protection. By this watershed program every field that is terraced, every dam that is constructed, is just that much protection. The Kansas River Basin is peculiarly subject to flood conditions. For that reason it should receive special consideration. And it is receiving it. It has six pilot watersheds authorized by Congress that are now being developed. Others are only waiting until the Hope-Aiken watershed bill becomes a law. Within 12 months throughout this Nation there should be hundreds of detention dams on the drawing boards or under construction. In this program of upstream flood prevention, the landowners are assessed 50 percent of the cost, whereas in the river-channel big-dam program 100 percent is borne by the Federal Government.

These dams are different from the multiple-purpose structures of the West and must be considered in their true light. I support wholeheartedly the provisions of local protection works for the cities in the Kansas River Basin. This work should and must be constructed at the earliest possible moment. These cities must not be denied local dikes and levees, cutoffs, and the like. These devices are needed regardless of the manner of reducing the river flow. That is an item deserving of much consideration.

Mr. Chairman, to sum up the objection to construction of this dam at Perry, Kans., the only purpose stipulated by its proponents is to prevent floods below. Recent inventions have shown us a better way. Congress has authorized and implemented such a program. We do not need two diametrically opposed programs to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, there is yet another and very cogent reason why this Congress should not authorize this dam. This is known as the rivers and harbors bill. A few weeks ago there was held in this city the annual convention of the Rivers and Harbors Association. President Eisenhower was invited to address this convention. Listen to his words, and I quote:

I have become convinced that before very long, America will almost unanimously look upon water as its single greatest resource.

So when a project is proposed that seems to me to be unrelated to all of the necessities of a river valley or of a slope in which it is located, I am very cold and unsympathetic. I believe that we have got to get into the Continental Divide and say—from there on down to the sea, studying where each drop of water falls—what we are going to do with it until it reaches the sea. I believe that any lesser survey of our water resources, our water uses, and our water control, is completely piecemeal, and we should reject it.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time it is my intention to offer an amendment to strike authorization of Perry Dam from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the Public

Works Committee during this 83d Congress. Its chairman the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], heads of the subcommittees, and Members of both the majority and minority, guided by the technical findings and assistance of the efficient Corps of Engineers, have each contributed bounteously to the volume of information leading to the omnibus bill of 1954.

Extensive hearings during both sessions of this Congress, covering a hundred or more projects, have impressed me with the magnitude of the Government's potential obligations if present policies of spreading financial aid to innumerable communities, able to establish desirability for their local needs, is continued.

Stemming from the original Federal legislation establishing Government's jurisdiction over the ocean harbors and navigable streams, successive acts of the Congress have legalized Federal participation in navigation facilities, flood control works, hydro power installations, irrigation systems, and, in recent years, optional responsibility for soil and water conservation, beach erosion and recreational facilities.

There are few habitable areas of this country, either coastwise or inland, that cannot, with one or with a combination of the above federally accepted responsibilities, present convincing evidence to justify the need for corrective or remedial structural works.

During a 6-week's inspection tour last summer, we heard local stories and observed specific problems all over the country, ranging from small fishing villages to gigantic multipurpose stream projects and deep sea harbors. None were without merit even though many lacked economic justification.

The Committee on Public Works has been occupied in these studies for many decades. The Corps of Engineers, co-operating, have utilized appropriated funds to make studies and submit detailed reports on authorized projects. Their filing cabinets are bulging with surveys, reports, cost estimates, and varying stages of plans that have accumulated over the years. Most of these are awaiting the time when Federal funds become available for construction. Some have been abandoned as no longer feasible.

I am advised that the estimated cost of navigation and flood control projects underway or on the drawing boards is approximately \$7½ billion. From year to year these are carefully screened for priority by the Corps of Engineers, and to their great credit, no reactivated project is given their approval until after a careful restudy and reappraisal has been made in the light of changed conditions. The Corps of Engineers has performed a wonderful job in carrying out the enactments of the Congress. Their backlog of planned projects is dormant only because Congress has not seen fit to provide funds with which to complete their work. In the present state of the Nation's economy there is little prospect that funds for any sizable amount of already planned construction will be available in the foreseeable future.

Since it is clear to all that there is no end to the number of areas in the 48 States where public improvements could not be of benefit to residents therein, and since nearly every congressional district can justify a worthwhile project, it is only natural that representatives of these areas will continue to press Congress for aid in their development. Hence the number of authorizations continue to increase each year.

Now, in 1954, the Public Works Committee submits to the Congress an omnibus bill that will authorize nearly \$1 billion for 150 or more additional public-works projects, many of which will probably lie quietly in the engineer's archives until they fade out with age awaiting appropriated dollars with which to bring their designs into being.

In an effort to meet the pressures from proponents for appropriation of available funds to be spread over wide areas, and with limited funds to allot, many deserving and economically sound projects are pushed aside, or, as is too often the case—especially with navigation facilities—they are allowed to become obsolete for want of maintenance and modernization.

This is particularly true in the Ohio River Basin. Beginning 50 years ago, over a period of 25 years, locks and dams that provided a 9-foot channel were completed at a cost of an estimated \$300 million. Since that time the traffic on this stream has increased tenfold. Many of these structures have served their period of usefulness. Navigation is greatly impeded and frequently halted as a result of the failure of some of the dams to control their navigation pools. These structures need replacement in order that the economy developed over the period of their existence may not suffer injury.

Then there is the Monongahela, the greatest coal-carrying stream in the world, having similar difficulties, although improvements authorized years ago are still awaiting appropriations for their completion. Failure to modernize and maintain navigation structures on this stream has caused the Pittsburgh area steel interests to abandon their most economical source of high-grade coal for lack of adequate transportation. A half-dozen flood-control projects in West Virginia, authorized many years ago, some of which are of vital concern to the residents of the Kanawha Valley and the city of Charleston because of their importance in maintaining an adequate supply of safe domestic water, lie dormant for lack of appropriations.

Aside from the fact that this bill projects public works well into the future and authorizes many projects that have little chance of every being completed, as a representative of the State of West Virginia, with its already authorized and deserving improvements pending, I can express little enthusiasm for an omnibus bill that has no provisions for the people of my State.

However, this statement is not intended to reflect neglect on the part of my committee. The Committee on Public Works during previous sessions, recognizing the needs of West Virginia, duly authorized the projects which have been

mentioned, thereby fulfilling its obligations. From then on, the responsibility for allocating a fair share of moneys for public works rests with the Committee on Appropriations.

Most any public-works project can be justified as an asset to the community it serves. Not all of them can return their cost in dividends. It is a matter of regret that economically justified public improvements once initiated frequently fail to receive appropriations to insure completion and completed works of proven economic value are not properly maintained.

Anticipating future demands for public-works projects that promise to draw heavily on the Nation's tax resources, it would seem logical and necessary to call for drastic reductions in foreign-aid spending on public-works projects in order to permit much needed construction within our own borders.

I can suggest no more convincing evidence that this phase of our foreign policy should be changed than to cite the number, variety, and extent of meritorious public improvements included in this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. With reference to the project that I was discussing, the freeze order of President Truman in 1951 was for the purpose of saving that \$1,300,000 for the Korean war effort. I have found since then that that was not covered back into the Treasury, but was used by the Army engineers for projects somewhere else in the United States.

Mr. NEAL. That may be true.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true, and it is not right.

Mr. NEAL. But, after all, I have no criticism of my committee when it comes to appropriating funds for any projects that are unfinished in the State of West Virginia. Appropriations are no part of our committee's duties. I feel that this bill covers many worthy projects, and if at any time in the future these projects can be allotted funds so that these people can realize the benefits which they need so much, I will be in favor of every project that we have endorsed, and certainly I am for this bill in every respect.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Public Works Committee for acting favorably on authorizing co-operation by the Federal Government in the project which will curb the flood conditions which damage areas in the Indiana Calumet industrial district at frequent intervals. During exceptional high water periods the Little Calumet River overflows its boundaries and inflicts devastating damage to homes and property over a considerable area in Lake County, Ind.

This project would provide adequate drainage and release the heavy flood conditions that during exceptional rain and spring thaw periods causes an uncontrollable high water deluge to the irreparable damage of hundreds of residents and industrial locations in the vicinity of the Calumet River. This flood con-

dition hits an area that is thickly populated by thousands who are employed in the mills and factories of the largest industrial section in the State of Indiana. The construction of this watershed will indirectly benefit a wide area which is some distance removed from the location of the worst flood center. In the spring of 1947 and also 1948 the damage caused by floods in this area amounted to millions of dollars. If all the other projects set out in this omnibus bill are as meritorious as the Little Calumet River project in northwest Indiana, I hope this legislation is unanimously passed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

(Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only for the purpose of getting one small point clarified, which gives me just a little bit of trouble. On page 17, section 102, there is a provision for reimbursement of local interests in connection with beach-erosion projects under certain circumstances. On lines 5 and 6 of that page there is this proviso:

Provided, That the work which may have been done on these projects was approved by the Chief of Engineers as being—

I am perfectly certain in my own mind that that refers to the approval by the Chief at any time prior to the seeking of an appropriation. I think that is supported by the language of your report which, since I discussed this with you informally, I found on page 5 of the report. But I want to make entirely certain that that does not by any chance refer to a formal approval at the time the work was done or before the work was done because that approval could not be made anyhow, since the project is not authorized until this bill is passed.

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is a proper interpretation of it. In other words, any work done prior to the enactment of this bill, where it has been approved by the Chief of Army Engineers. The gentleman is referring to beach-erosion work?

Mr. HAND. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. That would come under this bill and be paid for accordingly.

Mr. HAND. So the interpretation, as I understand it, especially after having examined your report is that any time that the Chief of Engineers approved actual work done prior to seeking an appropriation, is what the act means; is that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right. That is the way I understand it, and I believe that is correct.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman very much. While I have 30 seconds remaining, I would like to thank the committee for its unfailing courtesy during these hearings. Permit me to add that the inclusion in this bill of the beach-erosion projects for Atlantic City, Ocean City, and Cape May is a culmination of my months and years of work in this field. I trust the bill will pass promptly, and that in due course funds will be made available.

The history of this effort goes back about 8 years, to the basic legislation, to which my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] made such an effective contribution.

Now, for the first time, we have a very real prospect of help from the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Committee on Public Works for including section 205, which provides:

In addition to previous authorization, the sum of \$20 million is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by the Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended.

This will provide funds for continuance of such worthwhile projects as the Washita, Sandstone, Cowden-Cloud Chief, Beaver Creek, Cow Creek, and Hell Creek projects in Oklahoma, and other similar Oklahoma projects.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of congratulating the chairman of the committee and the members for reporting to the House what I consider to be an excellent piece of legislation, one that will make a great contribution to the internal domestic economy of America and one that will be an insurance against possible recession.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors for the consideration and courtesy which he gave to the local authorities from the Niagara frontier who came here to testify in support of the two projects included on page 10 of the bill, the Black Rock Channel on the Tonawanda River, and the deepening of the Little River at Niagara Falls. The two projects obligate the United States to the extent of \$300,000. Local interests are obligated to spend on those projects in excess of \$300,000, which manifests the desire and the need of the people of our area for those two projects, projects which should have been started many, many years ago. The Tonawanda River carries annually 5 million tons of petroleum, coal, and oil. It is now only 16 feet deep. It forces vessels to lighten their loads before they reach their terminal, adding greatly to the cost of transportation in that area. If we are to get any benefit at all from the St. Lawrence Seaway legislation which was passed by this Congress, then our connecting waterways must be deepened to at least 21-foot draft, or we suffer disaster in our area.

I believe that if every area receiving appropriations under this bill benefited as greatly from the dollars expended as

will the Niagara frontier, this bill should be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, the members of this fine Public Works Committee deserve every commendation for the study and effort and long hours of work that have gone into bringing out this fine bill. I personally want to thank them for the patient consideration they have shown to many of us who have been before them.

Mr. Chairman, there are 10 projects in H. R. 9859 of importance to the residents of my district. Some are very small, as such things go, involving only slight proposed expenditures. Others are more elaborate and expensive but all are highly desirable, both as part of a general overall pattern and as an improvement in local facilities. The proposed costs run from a low of \$20,300 to a high of \$101 million.

These 10 items in this bill that affect the Eastern Shore of Maryland are set forth on pages 4 and 5, namely, the Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay; Queenstown Harbor; Little Creek, Kent Island; Anchorage at Lowes Wharf; Nanticoke River at Bivalve; Webster Cove, Somerset County; Crisfield Harbor; Rhodes Point to Tyler-ton; Pocomoke River and Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay.

If this measure becomes law and congressional authorization is obtained for these projects, important progress will have been accomplished but let no one be misled into believing that these improvements will be physically constructed in the immediate future. First the national policy of freezing new river and harbor construction unless tied in with National Defense will have to be modified.

And right here, let me point out that there are several projects in the First District of Maryland for which there has been authorization for several years but the freeze placed by the Bureau of the Budget in 1950 has held up construction of them indefinitely. This list includes the badly needed improvements at Cambridge Harbor; Rock Hall Harbor; Honga River and Tar Bay; Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River; widening of Kent Island Narrows to name a few on which I, personally, have worked over the years. Funds were even appropriated to complete the first three on the list prior to 1950, but work orders were rescinded when the Korean fighting commenced.

Sometimes I am scolded for pushing for new authorizations while these older projects remain incomplete. The answer, of course, is that the interest of one project that is already authorized is not impaired by obtaining authorization for some other project in an entirely different area.

I find there is also another source of misunderstanding. Often I am asked, why has the Congress been urged to authorize these 10 projects and not the pet improvement in which the particular writer's community is vitally concerned? Only the other day I was asked rather

sharply why St. Peters Creek was not included in the present bill.

Here again the answer is quite simple. The present bill contains all the projects in the district that have been favorably reported up to this time by the Corps of Army Engineers. The committee will not consider any others. Therefore, the ones that are not included have either been unfavorably reported or are not yet officially reported. The latter is the status, by the way, with respect to the very meritorious project for St. Peters Creek. I hope the engineers will approve it soon but to date they have not so.

Mr. Chairman, pleasing as it is to secure authorizations for important and needed river and harbor improvements, after all it avails nothing until the work can be accomplished. Let us hope the Bureau of the Budget will soon lift the freeze. The cold war may last a long time. A thaw in this field is badly needed.

I am glad to be able to offer a bit of encouragement with respect to some maintenance work in the waters of the Chesapeake. I am advised that some activity of this type has been recommended to be initiated within the next few months.

These recommendations are as follows: Partial restoration of the jetty on the north side of the inlet at Ocean City, Md.; restoration of project dimensions in the channel in Chester River at the north end of Kent Island Narrows, in the channel connecting Chesapeake Bay and Honga River near Fishing Creek, in the channel leading from Tangier Sound to Ewell, and at Webster Cove, Somerset County.

I hope current maintenance plans will not be limited to these spots but welcome them as a step in the right direction.

(Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

(Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative of 1 of the 17 reclamation States, I want to say a word about the new Rivers, Harbors, Beach Erosion and Flood Control Authorization Act which is now before us.

I can perhaps speak on this legislation less partially than some. There is not one dime of the \$900 million authorization sought to be spent in Utah.

Mr. Chairman, during the past several weeks Members of Congress have been bombarded with literature in opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project. This project, now pending before the House Rules Committee, seeks authorization of \$1 billion for construction of dams and irrigation works over a 50-year period. The project will make it possible for 4 arid western States to use their share of the waters of the Colorado River.

Despite the fact that the Colorado River storage project has received the support of President Eisenhower and the approval of the Bureau of the Budget

and of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, it has been attacked for containing "hidden subsidies."

The alleged subsidies are due to the fact that historically the Government does not charge interest on money advanced to construct irrigation works. This is a policy that has been a part of our reclamation law since 1902.

Leaving aside this policy, let us examine the financing of the upper Colorado project as a whole. I think it would be of interest to those supporting this legislation today to contrast the project with some of the multipurpose dams and harbors and beach-improvement authorizations contained in the bill before us. Less than 1 percent of the entire cost of the upper Colorado River storage project is nonreimbursable. No project in this bill before us today requires repayment of more than 40 percent of the cost and in most instances the entire cost of the project is nonreimbursable.

Nevertheless the upper Colorado River storage project is the one that has been under the heaviest attack from the so-called proponents of economy and the opponents of Government subsidy.

As a matter of proven fact the water and power users of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming will repay to the United States Treasury 99.2 percent of the cost of the upper Colorado River project, including interest on the total power investment. In addition, the operation, maintenance and replacement charges will be borne by those who directly benefit from its construction. All this repayment will be completed within a 50-year period and the project will then produce for the Government an income of \$15 to \$20 millions per year in perpetuity.

I need only briefly mention the increased tax revenue that will result from lands that will be developed after the project is completed. This amounts to many times the cost of the project, as has been amply proved in other areas where reclamation has operated.

We in the arid West recognize the need for Government assistance to control floods, to dredge harbors and to prevent beach erosion. We have a difficult time, however, understanding the opposition of some of our eastern friends to western reclamation—when we in the West pledge our property to repay the cost of our projects—while beneficiaries in the East get theirs scot-free.

Let me compare the need for a flood control project with the need for a reclamation project.

The man along one of our rivers purchases some marginal land, knowing at the time of purchase that this land is subject to periodic floods. This fact only makes the land of low value. After purchasing it, however, he convinces Congress that a flood-control levee is necessary. This, in effect, drains his land and enhances its value, both for residential and for farm purposes. His advantage is obtained entirely at the cost of the taxpayers. He is under no obligation to pledge his land to repay the Government. Contrast that with a farmer in the west, who owns land that is subject to being cut off from an adequate water supply in

years of drought. This man prevails upon Congress to advance funds for reclamation. His land and earning power will consequently improve—just as was that of his fellow citizen who had the river bank property.

Does our western farmer, however, expect the taxpayers of the Nation to bear this cost?

Indeed not—he contracts with the Government to repay every dime.

It is difficult for us to see reason in the argument that the Federal Government should pay the cost of making land arable if excess water is drained from it, while the beneficiary should pay the cost if land is made arable by having water brought to it.

This bill before us today, however, has provisions in it that we would be ashamed to ask for in the West.

Federal funds are being asked for in this legislation to improve bathing beaches and the requests are justified on the grounds that the Federal expenditure will increase the beaches' value. No one would deny this. If the Government wants to spend half a million dollars of the taxpayers' money improving resorts, of course the value of those beaches will be increased by half a million dollars. But it occurs to me that the beneficiaries of these projects—the owners of resort hotels, motels, and restaurants—should be required to repay some of this cost. This bill makes no provision for such repayment.

I do not want to belabor the Members with repeated arguments, but I want them to know that we in the West have trouble understanding opposition to self-liquidating reclamation projects from Members who are outspoken in their support of similar projects which require no repayment at all and which often, as in the case of flood control structures, serve the same purpose.

I trust those who enthusiastically support this omnibus river and harbor bill today will be as enthusiastic in their support of a project that is necessary if four sovereign States are to grow and develop as nature intended.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I note with particular pleasure that the Committee on Public Works has included the Shilshole Bay breakwater in this bill, which is in my district. If you will look on pages 73 and 74 of the report you will see that this project has a very favorable ratio of benefits to cost of 1.74.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I may say that the people of Seattle have been trying to get this project for 20 years but not until the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] came here has it been possible to get it included in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. PELLY. The city of Seattle is cut in half by the Lake Washington ship canal and 200,000 people every day in automobiles have to pass over 4 drawbridges. This breakwater will allow

some of the smaller boats to remain outside, and thus a bad traffic situation in the city, and bad congestion in the waterway and Government locks would be relieved. This is a very worthwhile and worthy project.

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to discuss a project in which I have been interested for the past several years at Brookville in Jefferson County, Pa., I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here today on this public works bill, H. R. 9859, which includes flood-control projects. I just want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the Army engineers apparently do not seem to be interested in projects other than some gigantic, colossal, monumental projects that costs some several hundred millions of dollars. When you recommend to them a little project such as I am interested in at Brookville, Pa., which would give flood protection for this small community of several thousand people and which is periodically visited with these devastating floods, it would appear that because a project of this nature calls for the relocation of public utilities, sewers and highways, and so forth, that are troublesome, they do not become concerned about undertaking these surveys and reports.

Now I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that back in 1951, I appeared before the Public Works Committee with 2 projects, 1 at Reynoldsville, Pa., and 1 at Brookville, Pa. Now the one at Reynoldsville, Pa. is in the bill and the Brookville project left out. In 1951 this report for Brookville, Pa., was authorized by a resolution adopted the 18th of April 1951, by the House Committee on Public Works, and it was limited to a preliminary examination in scope. The preparation of the report was assigned by the Chief of Engineers, to the district engineer at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the general supervision of the division engineer, Ohio River division. Periodically since 1951 I have requested the United States engineers' office and also the district engineer to have this report completed, but somehow or other they failed to take action. Now, this matter involves two projects, 1 at Reynoldsville, Pa., and at Brookville. They are part of the same project, on Sandy Lick Creek, Jefferson County, Pa., on the same stream. They are 10 miles apart. I am unable to understand why they completed the survey and report on one and not the other.

In view of the fact that I have insisted for the last 3 years to get this project report completed, they have failed to do so. Now they say, "Well, we did not have money available to conduct a survey." And that is why I contend they can find hundreds of thousands of dollars for surveys for these gigantic projects, but when it comes to a little flood-control project such as at Brookville, Pa., that would

cost approximately \$3,500 for the report and survey, that they cannot get that work finished. Now the people from the Brookville area are appealing to me to secure help from their Government for relief from these periodic devastating floods that every spring and summer are visited upon the community, destroying property and upsetting their economic and industrial life. In several instances industries located there are concerned about expansion because of flood conditions. Also, locating new industries becomes difficult because industrialists say, "We are not going to locate our industries in an area where you have these devastating floods that are visited on the community every spring and fall, and, therefore, until you can assure us that flood protection is given us, we are not interested or will not entertain such a proposal until we have such assurance."

So I have been before your committee repeatedly. I have talked to every member of your committee on both sides asking consideration. The failure of the engineers to develop the report is no fault of mine. Therefore I am unable to secure consideration for a small flood-control project such as this Brookville project that involves \$600,000, where the people of this community were willing to raise the money by a bond issue to handle their part of the costs to give them the necessary flood protection. Now, it is not my fault. You say it is not your fault. You state you cannot accept this project because of the fact that the engineers have not prepared a report. The engineers have not prepared a report and therefore there is nothing that can be done.

I took the matter up with the United States engineers' office knowing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had prepared a report which had been submitted to the United States engineers' office and requested that an informal report be submitted to the Public Works Committee relative to the matter and basing it on the letter received from the Department of Forests and Waters of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I shall quote parts of the letter from Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. It states:

Reynoldsville and Brookville are both on Sandy Lick Creek, a tributary of the Allegheny, though they are separated one from the other by a distance of approximately 10 river miles. As you know, we have completed a survey and report on the Reynoldsville project and have testified on this proposal in a recent hearing before your committee. Because the Reynoldsville project is a local channel improvement project and not immediately adjacent to Brookville, our field investigations at Reynoldsville have not necessitated surveying the Brookville area downstream. The resolution your letter mentioned, calling for submission of a report of preliminary examination scope on Brookville, was approved by your committee on April 18, 1951. Since that time, as you know, funds appropriated for examinations and surveys have been most limited, allowing us to carry on only about 10 percent of our survey report backlog. We have not been able to make any funds available toward the Brookville examination and have been unable to accomplish any of the field work and office study necessary to permit the giving

of sound estimates of cost or damage reduction.

Our recent informal queries to representatives of the department of forests and waters of the Commonwealth have established that they have developed preliminary plans for a possible Commonwealth project. Information of these plans have been transmitted to the borough. This proposal would involve certain channel improvement on the main stem and tributaries, as well as construction of certain walls and dikes to give protection against a flood equivalent to that of 1936. The Commonwealth stated its preliminary estimate of cost for construction to be \$450,000, exclusive of relocations, lands, easements, and rights-of-way. If this plan were accepted, the borough would be expected to bear one-fourth of the cost of construction, provide lands, easements and rights-of-way, to give protection to the Commonwealth against damages, to arrange any necessary relocations, and undertake maintenance and operation of the project upon completion. I understand that the cost of lands, easements and rights-of-way has been estimated by the borough to approximate \$150,000. I have not been able to secure any information to permit the establishment of economic justification for the Commonwealth's plan, but it has been reported to me that the Commonwealth has estimated that the 1936 flood caused damages which at present day prices would amount to \$600,000. I believe the borough estimates these damages as somewhat higher.

So, it may be necessary to wait now for an additional 3 or 4 years before there is another authorization bill presented to the House, and the community of Brookville's progress is retarded. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has indicated a great interest in this project; the county has indicated a great interest in this project; and the local municipality has indicated its willingness to cooperate, but it cannot get the Federal Government to take action. Now, if we do not have another authorization bill for the next several years, then the project will be held up and held in obedience until such a bill is presented. I call to your attention the fact that the United States engineers have turned in a remarkable performance both in times of peace and in times of war over a long period of years and I have every confidence in them. However, it is my opinion they should give more consideration to the small projects such as this Brookville, Pa., project in which I am interested.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to inform the gentleman that this bill contains a recommendation for two dams at a cost of at least \$60 million that we do not want, and we are better off without, and we would just like to trade them to you.

Mr. GAVIN. I would certainly like to trade. I will settle for the \$600,000 Brookville project rather than \$60 million projects, and if you can work it out with the engineers, my good friend, I will be glad to accept your most generous offer. We would be saving the American taxpayers some \$59 million and everyone would be pleased and satisfied. This merely proves what I have been stating.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Maybe we can work it out in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

This House does not have a Member who is more diligent in his efforts to serve the people of his district than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. The gentleman has seen me many times concerning this project. He is not to blame personally for the situation that exists; neither is the Committee on Public Works of the House to blame, and neither is the Corps of Army Engineers.

In a few words, the situation is this. The Corps of Engineers state that they do not have enough money to make all the surveys requested of them. This survey was ordered in 1951. It has not been made. The corps claims they do not have enough money to make all of the surveys requested, and therefore this project has not been surveyed.

I hope that within the very near future money will be provided by the Congress to give the Engineers sufficient money to make the surveys which have been requested, including the project to which the gentleman has made reference in his district. I regret very much that the situation is as it is; but such are the facts.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I sincerely hope sufficient appropriations will be made by the Congress to permit these surveys, because these floods are devastating and costly. I think it is the wisest investment of the taxpayers' dollars the Congress can make to give flood protection to these small communities that are hit periodically with these destructive and recurring floods that destroy property and cause great damage, and in many instances wreck the economic and industrial life of these communities.

I want to say further to my good friend, although the gentleman regrets the situation we are in, that does not secure the authorization of the project at Brookville, Pa. I am interested in having the proposed project accepted in this bill, and if the gentleman can make any suggestions looking to that end, I would appreciate it.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman understands the workings and the procedure of the Congress. I am sure he would not ask anything that is either unreasonable or against the rules of the House.

Mr. GAVIN. I assure the gentleman that I am not unreasonable. I have been working on this project for several years. The people of this community, Brookville, Pa., have been patient and now expect their Government to give them some relief from these devastating floods, and they are entitled to it.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the Committee that it has been the custom for several years to read rivers and harbors bills by sections so that the Clerk will read one section at a time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question concerning one project. May I ask it now?

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it took the administrations of a number of Presidents before we could get \$100 million for the St. Lawrence seaway, which passed the Congress this year. I call attention to an item on page 4 of this bill. In this seven-line item there is an authorization of \$101 million. That is for this one project. That is a million dollars more than the allotment for the St. Lawrence seaway. I am not finding fault with this project, but it seems to me that the people of the Great Lakes area have to take about 40 years to get anything done for that area, while here there is, in a seven-line item, \$101 million authorized. I assume it is a splendid project. I am not a member of this subcommittee, but this situation could not help but impress itself upon me, when I thought of the fact that we had to go through a full-dress debate here in the House on I do not know how many occasions—only to see the project go into the ashcan on all but the last—to get \$100 million for the St. Lawrence seaway. While, as I have said, here in a seven-line item \$101 million is authorized. That is wonderful. The Members who fought for the St. Lawrence seaway had to go through a very trying ordeal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. We of the Middle West have been very patient and long-suffering. I think, in connection with the item to which the gentleman referred calling for \$101 million and only seven lines in length in this bill that the question of national defense entered into it, as I remember the testimony before our committee. That had something to do with its being included in this bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I assume that the national defense question had not been divorced from the Great Lakes region. We were called the hub of the arsenal of democracy in the darkest hour of this country.

Mr. RAYBURN. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, which, of course, I shall not, I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question or two. There is a project in my neighborhood, especially in the neighborhood of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for a project on the tributaries of the Red River in Texas, Oklahoma, Arkan-

sas, and Louisiana. I understand the report on that came in to the committee only on last Friday. There have been no hearings on it. Is it the policy of the committee not to accept any matters or any amendment to this bill upon which hearings have not been held and upon which there is not a favorable report?

Mr. DONDERO. That is the policy of the committee. I may say to my able and warm friend from Texas that the committee passed a resolution on June 28 to close the hearings. We have not heard anything since that date. In this case, the gentleman spoke to me about it. I endeavored to find some way whereby the project might be accepted, but it seems to transgress all the rules to do so. There have been no hearings either here on in the Senate on this particular project because it came in too late. In fact, it came in Friday night, and it is now at the printer's being printed.

Mr. RAYBURN. So the committee does not know exactly what is in the report?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports herein-after designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public, No. 14, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document No. 243, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.: House Document No. 556, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

Lynn Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 568, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,000; *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash the cost of dredging the easterly 300 feet of the Municipal Channel to a depth of 22 feet, presently estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

Weymouth Fore River, Mass.: House Document No. 555, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,400,000;

Town River, Quincy, Mass.: House Document No. 108, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,000;

Scituate Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 241, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$375,000;

Fall River Harbor, Mass.: House Document No. 405, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$694,000;

Bullocks Point Cove, R. I.: House Document No. 242, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,400;

Sakonnet Harbor, R. I.: House Document No. 436, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$555,400; *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash, 4 percent of the cost of the project, presently estimated as \$23,000;

Patchogue River, Conn.: House Document No. 164, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$135,000;

Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.: House Document No. 488, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$112,500;

Westchester Creek, N. Y.: House Document No. 92, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$32,200;

Hudson River, N. Y.: House Document No. 228, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$31,928,000;

Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.: House Document No. 89, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$138,000;

Hackensack River, N. J.: House Document No. 252, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,973,900;

Mispillion River, Del.: Senate Document No. 229, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$469,400;

Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document No. 123, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101 million; *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution for the construction of all bridges, including approaches thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

Queenstown Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 718, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$31,900;

Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Md.: House Document No. 715, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md.: House Document No. 90, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$29,000;

Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md.: House Document No. 91, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$192,600;

Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md.: House Document No. 619, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,300;

Crisfield Harbor, Md.: House Document No. 435, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,750; *Provided*, That the cash contribution required of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.: House Document No. 51, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,100;

Pocomoke River, Md.: House Document No. 486, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$678,300;

Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.: House Document No. 444, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

Parrotts Creek, Va.: House Document No. 46, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.: Senate Document No. 122, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

Deep Creep, Accomack County, Va.: House Document No. 477, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$95,000;

Oyster Channel, Va.: Senate Document No. 49, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C.: House Document No. 453, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$108,000;

Smiths Creek, N. C.: House Document No. 170, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$102,000;

Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, N. C.: House Docu-

ment No. 411, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway: House Document No. 379, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.: House Document No. 469, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$765,000;

Savannah Harbor, Ga.: House Document No. 110, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;

Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla.: House Document No. 446, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$82,200;

Hillsboro River, Fla.: House Document No. 567, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;

Apalachicola Bay, Fla.: House Document No. 156, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$98,000;

Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island: House Document No. 557, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

St. Joseph Bay, Fla.: House Document No. 595, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,312,000;

Mobile Harbor, Ala.: House Document No. 74, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,778,000;

Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.: House Document No. 394, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$70,000;

Bayou Segnette Waterway, La.: House Document No. 413, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$520,000;

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.: Senate Document No. 80, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,875,000;

Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex.: House Document No. 478, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,300;

Aransas Pass, Tex.; in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: House Document No. 376, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

Turtle Cove, Tex.: House Document No. 654, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: House Document No. 89, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$829,100; *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests;

Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.: House Document No. 251, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$82,600;

Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.: House Document No. 230, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,000;

Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn.: House Document No. 347, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$142,000;

Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: Senate Document No. 81, 83d Congress; and a monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of the Dover and Eureka Dams as described in House Document No. 761, 79th Congress, "Cumberland River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky," authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment of the project hereby approved;

Green and Barren Rivers, Ky.: Senate Document No. 82, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system work;

Knife River Harbor, Minn.: House Document No. 463, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$219,900;

Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 434, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;

Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 554, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$217,200;

Holland Harbor, Mich.: House Document No. 282, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$574,400; *Provided*, That local interests

will contribute 25 percent of the cost of dredging section B, but not to exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required by the project document;

Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.: House Document No. 142, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$225,000;

Toledo Harbor, Ohio.: House Document No. 620, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

Erie Harbor, Pa.: House Document No. 345, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$174,000;

Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.: House Document No. 423, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: House Document No. 246, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;

Oswego Harbor, N. Y.: House Document No. 487, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,459,000;

Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.: House Document No. 161, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon this project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.: House Document No. 389, 83d Congress: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and central basin recommended in the project report and presently estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof;

Port Hueneme, Calif.: House Document No. 362, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,437,000;

Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 83, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,758,700;

Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 133, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington: House Document No. 249, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island: Senate Document No. 8, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.: House Document No. 425, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.: House Document No. 412, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$421,800;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Breakwater), Wash.: House Document No. —, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$323,700;

Anacortes Harbor, Wash.: Senate Document No. 102, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$179,300;

Neah Bay, Wash.: House Document No. 404, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$139,250;

Bellingham Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 558, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,366,650;

Blaine Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 240, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$436,000;

Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.: House Document No. 536, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,397,300;

Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.: House Document No. 155, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$477,900.

Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.: House Document No. 569, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$395,500;

Quillayute River, Wash.: House Document No. 579, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$425,550;

Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 182, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 182, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

Honolulu Harbor, T. H.: House Document No. 717, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,022,000;

BEACH EROSION

Hampton Beach, N. H.: House Document No. 325, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$140,000;

Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 134, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$189,000;

Revere Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 146, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$402,900;

Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.: House Document No. 145, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$409,000;

South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document No. 490, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,550;

Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Conn.: House Document No. 474, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach; \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3), Conn.: House Document No. 203, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,600 for Prospect Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Conn.: House Document No. 248, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$26,510 for Short Beach; and \$119,000 for Seaside Park;

Atlantic City, N. J.: House Document No. 538, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,044,000;

Ocean City, N. J.: House Document No. 184, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$105,000;

Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.: House Document No. 206, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$260,000;

Virginia Beach, Va.: House Document No. 186, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

Pinellas County, Fla.: House Document No. 380, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document No. 28, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,176,400;

Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Document No. 229, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$185,000;

Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document No. 502, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White City Park;

Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.: House Document No. 231, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.: House Document No. 343, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$136,500;

Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.: House Document No. 277, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,874,000;

Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.: House Document No. 349, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.: House Document No. 29, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$73,700;

Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document No. 227, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$283,700.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects was approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Mobile, Ala., and the State of Alabama, their successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend Channel, in the county of Mobile, Ala., by the construction and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama: *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be commenced until the plans and location therefor have been filed with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the causeway hereby authorized is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of this act and the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby expressly reserved.

SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1954."

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. That section 3 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, 74th Cong.), as amended by section 2 of the act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, Numbered 761, 75th Cong.), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire 5 years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the following provisions shall be observed:

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted

by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

Sec. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-after designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecticut River Basin, approved by the act of June 22, 1936 (Public Law No. 738, 74th Cong.), as amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, of a flood-control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene, N. H., in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs heretofore authorized.

That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecticut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend sites, in lieu of the plan of 8 reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the 8 reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 500, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,469,000.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 643, 80th Congress, with such modifications thereof as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the authorized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all work over and beyond that previous authorization such conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress, based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the Bureau of the

Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*, That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan authorized in this act which may be started prior to establishment of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7 million for partial accomplishment of said plan.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the following items of work and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

(a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated February 2, 1954, as concurred in by the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1954, with such modifications as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation lock) of \$32 million, in addition to the \$15 million increase in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which \$15 million shall be applied to the item described in this paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be necessary for construction of the project except that local interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended, with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, La.: *Provided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by the United States in connection with this item: *And provided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engineers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds herein authorized to be appropriated.

(b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Mississippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, La., substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 53, 82d Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$440,000.

(c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 85, 83d Congress.

(d) Modification of the authorized project for the New Madrid floodway substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 183, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,743,000.

BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEX.

The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide flood protection for the city of Houston, Tex., as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939, and previous acts, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 250, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEX.

The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 535, 81st Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be

appropriated the sum of \$40 million for partial accomplishment of that plan.

GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEX.

The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 344, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,-254,000.

GUADALUPE RIVER, TEX.

The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Tex., authorized by section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such authorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the provisions of this act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approximately 750,000 acre-feet (of which 380,000 acre-feet shall be for flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood control, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of development of electric power, at an estimated total cost of \$13,-300,000.

The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Federal Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may appropriately be allocated by water conservation, stream-flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation. No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for development of electric power shall be made under this section unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such installation will actually be constructed.

The costs allocated to local interests under this section shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this act. The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for maintenance and operation of such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such operation and maintenance; the \$1,400,000 to be contributed during the construction period shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for construction of the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that purpose; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accordance with this act, with all expenses of construction, operation, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local interests and with such power to be made available to such local interests.

Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir, \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time or times during the period of such construc-

tion, as the Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the contributions allocated to local interests under section 2, with interest thereon at the rate of 2½ percent per annum, shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over a period not in excess of 50 years.

The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement with local interests providing for the payments heretofore described and for all other matters relating to the operation and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water conservation and stream-flow regulation for development of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide that the utilization of water for power development shall not be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimentation purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 464, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 436, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Okla., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 185, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River in urban areas at Alton, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 397, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$2,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 281, 83d Congress, excepting only the improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Henderson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8, Monroe County, Ill., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 396, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

The project on the Mississippi River for local flood protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 247, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,046,300.

The project for flood protection on the upper Iowa River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 375, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$979,600.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 642, 81st Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 549, 81st Congress.

The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., as modified and extended by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modified to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Provided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and public relocations which local interests would have been required to bear had the approved Government plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton River, Iowa and Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 561, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux River, Iowa, authorized by the act of August 4, 1947, is hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 127, 83d Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri River and tributaries at Marmarth, N. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 134, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$212,300.

COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 154, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pa., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 716, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$570,000.

The project for flood control and related purposes on the Paint Rock River, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. —, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in that document, local interests shall comply with the provisions of local cooperation contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also construct and maintain local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally as outlined in House Document No. —, 83d Congress.

KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICH.

The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 98, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IND.

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 153, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Balona Creek, Calif., approved in the act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control on the American River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5 million for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the lower San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., approved in the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180 million for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, for which the sum of \$75 million was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power development in the following projects in tributary basins, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 531, 81st Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oreg., and Green Peter

Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg., including White Bridge, reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 54, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The project for flood protection on the Waioala Stream and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, T. H., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 529, 81st Congress, at an estimated cost of \$347,000.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, which include the following-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Ipswich River, Mass.

Neponset River, Mass.

Juniata River at Lewiston and other points in Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control.

Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Tex.

Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.

Coos Bay, Oreg.

SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of \$20 million is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended.

SEC. 206. That section 7 of the act approved August 18, 1941 (Public, No. 228, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 5 of the act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, No. 526, 79th Cong.), as further amended by the act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, No. 60, 83d Cong.), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

"That 75 percent of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share

to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein."

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary examinations and surveys or works of improvement authorized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure."

SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed \$2 million from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year."

SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there shall be established in the civil works activities under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, 7 positions to be placed in grade GS-16 and 2 positions to be placed in grade GS-17, in the general schedule established by that act.

SEC. 210. That section 4 of the act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, No. 526, 79th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the Department of the Army, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut tim-

ber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

SEC. 211. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1954."

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: On page 19, line 4, add a new section as follows:

"Land will be acquired for the construction of flood control and multipurpose reservoirs authorized under this act in such a manner as to facilitate potential development of recreational uses of the reservoir by Federal, State, or local authorities, whenever such recreational development would not interfere with the basic purpose of the reservoir."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is the one I referred to in my remarks during general debate. As I stated then, this amendment is brought to the floor and was not acted on in committee because of the general agreement of the committee that it be withheld until this time.

At the time there was no report at all from the Corps of Engineers in regard to this amendment. We have since had an adverse report from the corps, but there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget, there is no report from the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife, no report from the Department of the Interior or any other Government agency that might have an equal concern in regard to the recreational development of the areas involved. So I think it is fair to state here that this amendment is actually something to give expression to the sense of the Congress in regard to recreational development in these areas. It in no sense would modify or change any reservoirs that are authorized under this bill, because they were all reported at a time when the land-acquisition policy to which I made reference had come into effect.

The amendment which I offer is designed to make certain that the reservoirs constructed under authorization of this act will be available to the general public throughout the country for recreational use; in other words, for those who

want to hunt and fish and boat upon these reservoirs. Actually in this bill, in the first section, we are authorizing a great many expenditures for boat harbors, small-boat harbors in which no part of the use will be recreational. Here in this amendment I am merely seeking to state the sense of the Congress that these manmade lakes built at public expense should in no way be built in such a way as to deny their recreational development for the general public.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is aware of the fact that it has been the practice of the Army engineers in recent years to cede back to the State the frontage on a lot of these reservoirs. That has been the case with the Tygart Dam in West Virginia, which has made an excellent recreational center.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is quite correct. By this amendment, I am striving to make sure that that policy is not stopped. I asked the engineers to show me how this new policy would affect a lake or reservoir in Mississippi, and they told me that the recreational areas which had been established there, could not have been established under this new policy. The recreational areas are being built entirely at State and local and private expense with no expense at all to the Federal Government. I hope the committee will accept this amendment in order that we may indicate merely by this statement in the bill, which is very permissive in tone, that it is the desire of the Congress that these reservoirs, which would be constructed under this authority, will be available for recreational purposes to the general public.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I join with the gentleman in his statement. There is a reservoir in my district which is desired overwhelmingly by the people for recreational purposes, and I may say that the Army engineers have been most cooperative in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. One of the reservoirs, which I have in mind, was unanimously opposed originally by the people of the area because they did not want to give up their land, but now the people who live in that area are unanimously in favor of it because the recreational facilities are such a great asset.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's amendment to overthrow the recently adopted policy of the Corps of Engineers with respect to land acquisitions?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The purpose is not to overthrow that policy, but merely to indicate that it is the sense of the Congress that that policy should not be administered in such a manner as to deny proper recreational development of those reservoirs being authorized in this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. What does it mean then? Here the Corps of Engi-

neers has adopted this new policy in order to get away from going in and purchasing a lot of land and taking that land off the tax rolls, thus depriving the local governments and private citizens locally the right to have that property on the tax rolls, and then arrogating to themselves the right to lease it or furnish it to whomever they might choose. I think there is a danger in that old policy, and I am afraid that the language that the gentleman suggests is throwing us right back into that kind of a policy.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The old policy had many mistakes in it and I am not trying to revert back to that old policy. I am merely attempting to say that in acquisitions that are made in the future, they should not be made in such a rigid way that the land that is to be acquired is not acquired in such a manner that they will deny the recreational development of the area. As the policy has been interpreted in certain areas that would be the effect of this new policy, and that would be without any particular savings to the Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi offered this amendment to our committee at one of its very last sessions. Of course, there was very little time to consider it. I think most members of the committee, including myself, were somewhat in sympathy with the objective that the gentleman desires to achieve by his amendment. However, I submitted his amendment to the agencies of Government interested, and they are opposed to it, particularly the Corps of Army Engineers. The reason they are opposed to it is because of the recently established policy between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior in regard to land acquisition. I want to read from the report of the engineers, which has been submitted to me by Gen. B. L. Robinson, Acting Chief of Engineers, a few lines that pertain to the question before the committee.

He says:

The acquisition of lands for recreational development, as contemplated by the proposed Smith amendment, is not in accord with this policy, and therefore I am unable to concur in the amendment.

That comes from the Department of the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Under Secretary of Agriculture, also commenting on this amendment, had this to say, after discussing the question of acquisition of land for recreational purposes:

However, it is felt that the policy respecting acquisition of lands for recreational purposes should be considered along with other policy questions relating to the responsibility of the Federal Government in the recreational field at all Federal reservoir areas. It is understood that the Bureau of the Budget is currently studying these matters.

The Bureau of the Budget has not reported on the amendment, because it was offered so late.

To adopt this amendment would override the findings of the Army engineers,

and the Secretary of Agriculture, because they believe that the policy now established between the Army engineers and the Department of the Interior fully covers it. Therefore, to adopt this amendment might run counter to that policy and would do more harm than good. For that reason I ask the committee to vote down the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This matter came up in the course of our hearings on the Army civil-functions appropriation bill this year, and it was explained to the members of our subcommittee to some extent. While the language of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is broad, simply stating an objective, I cannot feel other than that adopting this amendment, in view of the fact that there has been a change of policy within the course of the last year or so, would be interpreted as expressing the will of Congress contrary to the adoption of this new policy, and would, in effect, put us on record that Congress wished them to go back to the old policy which was in effect at that time. Since that includes condemnation of land, separation of private property by the Federal Government, for purposes which extend over into the marginal area, as far as the public is concerned, I do not think the House ought to take this step, in the light of the background and the interpretation that would be placed upon it.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to point out in respect to the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin that if I desired to establish a new land act policy I would have so stated. I am simply trying to establish in this amendment the sense of the Congress that these man-made lakes, which were created at an expenditure of millions and millions of dollars, should be made available to the general public for recreational development. I do not feel that this Congress wants to go on record, by turning down this amendment, that it does not believe in recreational development.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] is one of the most hardworking and diligent members of the Committee on Public Works. He is also one of the most constructive. I am opposed to his amendment, however, not because I object to the idea, but because I think the Committee on Public Works and the House itself have not had time to evaluate his suggestion. His proposal was made not to any meeting of the Committee on Flood Control but in the next to the last session of the Public Works Committee. We had no opportunity to study it. I have a phobia against this continual acquisition of more and more land by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government today owns 711,000 square miles of land in the 48 States of the Union, or 455 million acres.

One acre out of every four is owned by the Federal Government and has been taken off the tax rolls. I think we ought to reverse that policy. The gentleman's amendment should lay over until next year, until the beginning of next year at which time he may introduce a bill covering this situation so that it can have the study of the Public Works Committee. I am not objecting to the idea, but I do not think we ought to go into something in haste, then repent at leisure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) there were—ayes 19, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 35, immediately after line 6 insert:

"WEST SHORE OF LAKE ERIE

"The projects for flood protection along the shores of Lake Erie are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 424, 83d Congress at an estimated cost of \$1,900,000."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of directing my remarks to the Public Works Committee in the hope I may persuade that committee that this project recommended by the Corps of Engineers be included in this omnibus legislation.

I might first point out that the area involved is on the west shore of Lake Erie, Monroe County, in the Second District of Michigan which I have the honor to represent. In March of 1952 this area was devastated by a flood which resulted from two main factors. One was the high level of the Great Lakes; the other unusually severe storms. I might point out that this west shore of Lake Erie lies roughly between Toledo and the mouth of the Detroit River. Of the two projects involved Lakewood Luna Pier is just north of Toledo, and Detroit Beach is north of the city of Monroe, the county seat of Monroe County.

The Lakewood Luna Pier project would cost approximately a million dollars and the Detroit Beach project would cost approximately \$500,000.

After the flood which I mentioned in March 1952 the Public Works Committee of the House, the committee in charge of this legislation, adopted a resolution on June 26, 1952, in which it instructed the Corps of Engineers to make a study of the high levels of the Great Lakes.

Included in that resolution—and this is of extreme importance to me—we find this language: This study by the Corps of Engineers should be undertaken "with a view to determining the property damage resulting from changes in levels of the Great Lakes and the feasibility of measures to prevent the recurrence of damage."

It was pursuant to the instructions of the Committee on Public Works that the Corps of Engineers made this study, and

after looking over the subject, recommended three projects in this extremely low lying area on the western shore of Lake Erie.

I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], will confirm my statement, that the committee did not refuse to include these projects in this omnibus bill on their merits but only because of a legal technicality. A doubt was raised by the Budget Bureau whether flood-control projects on the Great Lakes are permissible under existing legislation or whether there ought to be an amendment to the general legislation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It was the feeling of the subcommittee that perhaps there was a great deal of merit to those projects which have been surveyed. On the other hand, there is no basic law to justify Congress going ahead and turning out these projects regarding floods which are the result of a continuing rise of the water level in the lake. It was the fear of the committee that if we placed these projects in the authorization bill, that we would open up that bill to the inclusion of similar projects in all parts of the country where they had not heretofore been included. It was the feeling of the committee that some basic legislation should be enacted by the Congress prior to the time that projects of that kind were considered. So we are recommending that they introduce basic legislation in the next Congress to clarify the situation where areas are so damaged from rising lake waters and the storms and the waves.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. I might say that the Corps of Engineers testified before the Committee on Public Works of the House as well as the committee in the other body and seemed to be of the opinion that existing law did authorize these projects. The question was raised by the Bureau of the Budget, which did not disapprove the engineers' report but did raise this question which bothers the committee.

I might point out for the Committee's information that already in this same area two projects have been approved in the past for the same kind of damage, Reno Beach and Harold Farms, east of Toledo on Lake Erie, in the district represented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS]. Another precedent is Estral Beach, between Monroe and Detroit on Lake Erie, which suffered severe damage in March of 1952. The Corps of Engineers from its emergency fund repaired an existing dike at Estral Beach to protect it from the same kind of flood damage with which we are concerned here.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not recall that project being mentioned as a precedent, although Reno Beach-Harold Farms project, which was previously carried out, somewhat similar to this, was cited as a possible precedent.

Mr. MEADER. The St. Lawrence seaway has now become law and shortly will become a reality. Now, in the levels of

lakes and rivers, there are always two conflicting interests: First, there are those who desire to use those lakes and rivers for navigation purposes, and second there are the riparian owners who seek protection from high waters and floods. The St. Lawrence seaway will be useful only if deep-draft vessels can use the channels and the harbors. The depth of the water will very substantially affect the utility of the St. Lawrence seaway system.

I want to quote from an article by Prof. William C. Hoad, of the University of Michigan, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks on February 24, 1953, at page 1422:

Another and vastly more important benefit (of high water levels) is the increased depth in harbors and dredged navigation channels, which permits the big freight carriers to load to greater depths. During the hearings on the Chicago drainage canal controversy, back in 1925, the Lake Carriers' Association produced figures to show that freight savings or losses amounted to \$500,000 a year for each inch of increase or decrease of depth in the navigation channels. The carrying of ore, grain, coal, and other bulk commodities in Great Lakes channels has increased considerably since then, while costs per ton of freight moved have also shown a large increase as measured in present-day dollars.

In other words, the cost of these projects, roughly, \$1,500,000, would be offset by the reduced cost of carrying the traffic and freight on the Great Lakes, and in the reduced cost for the reduced amount of dredging which would be necessary if you are to protect the riparian owners at the same time you are providing adequate channels for deep draft navigation.

I hope the committee will give this matter serious consideration and if it should, perhaps, be adopted in the other body, I hope the subcommittee in charge of this measure will feel kindly disposed toward it in conference. I know how difficult it is to persuade the Committee of the Whole to take action in opposition to the work of a committee that has studied a matter so very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent and at the request of Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MEADER was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. I should like to say to the House that the gentleman has been most diligent in bringing this project before the subcommittee and also to my attention on several occasions. It so happens that I live not too far from where this project is located, and I personally know something of the problem that confronts the people in that area. In fact, I fly over it about once a month. I can see it from the air. I hope, too, the law will be clarified so that this matter may be considered at some future time so that the objective which the gentleman has in mind, through his amendment, which he intended to offer, will be achieved.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

[Mr. REAMS addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Flood Control voted unanimously against the inclusion of this project in the authorization bill. The committee, nevertheless, was very much impressed by arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] that the project had considerable merit. However, it was the feeling of the committee that if the committee voted this project into the authorization bill we would establish a precedent whereby we would be compelled in the future to include all projects for all areas on all lakes where the land area was damaged by high lake waters.

The water laws of our Nation are complicated. If the flood comes from a stream or a river, the Federal Government pays all the cost of providing flood-control works except that of acquiring easements, rights-of-way, and the relocation of highway bridges. In the case of beach erosion along the ocean shore it is necessary that the local interests, provided all the land is publicly owned, put up two-thirds of the cost. The Federal Government will put up only one-third of the cost.

It was the unanimous feeling of the committee that before projects of the kind mentioned in his amendment be accepted that changes should be made in the basic law. Our committee recommends to gentlemen, who are interested in projects of this kind, that they introduce such basic legislation at the opening of the new session of Congress.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REAMS. May I ask the gentleman again not to confuse this project with erosion or with a flood that comes from the tides. This is high water just like on the rivers. The lakes just rise and get higher, just exactly as the Ohio River does.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman's argument that a lake is really not a lake but just a wide space in the river is very ingenious. The committee, however, cannot accept that argument.

Furthermore, the Army engineers have requested \$970,000 to carry on an investigation of the entire problem of this rising of the lake waters in the Great Lakes. Perhaps the engineers will find within a very short time a better solution than has been proposed to correct the situation of which Mr. REAMS and Mr. MEADER complain.

The main objection of the committee, however, is that this amendment changes the flood control and beach-erosion laws of the Nation. Before we do that, there should be some basic legislation to justify action on legislation of this kind.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works I want to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], and I wholeheartedly associate myself with his amendment.

These floods on the Great Lakes are something that do not occur with any degree of frequency. When they do happen they can be very devastating, just as the floods of the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri are. We certainly feel it is the responsibility of the Federal Government in those cases.

As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] has pointed out, there is ample precedent for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. What the gentleman offers here was recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers.

I would like to point out that these are international waters on the Great Lakes. These are not just any lakes within the territorial United States, these are international waters. I believe there is plenty of precedent for this. I do not think we have to interpret existing laws unreasonably in order to vote with a clear conscience in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 31, after line 6, insert the following:

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, at St. Louis, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. —, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$112,880,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, at this time having offered the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and explain the reason for presenting it in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment was offered to call to the attention of the House that this is a longtime part of the overall plan in the Mississippi River flood-control program, and has been in the offing for at least the past 20 years. The reason it has not been before us before now is that it has taken some considerable time to make the surveys and studies. As you can see, from the amount of money in this project, \$112 million, it is a sizable project. The survey of the Army engineers was not completed in time for this matter to have been brought to the attention of our House committee, and that is the reason I am withdrawing the amend-

ment, because it would be contrary to the procedure of the committee to consider it on the floor. However, this project has been submitted to the Public Works Committee of the other body and hearings have been held on it. It is entirely possible that the other body will put this particular project in their companion bill, and, therefore, it might be a matter upon which our committee in conference might be called upon to consider. For that reason, I wanted to call it to the attention of the House. I want to say again in this connection that this is an old plan. The actual survey and plans, of course, have just recently been developed. One of the things that is causing difficulty is that in the planning for flood control around St. Louis, Mo., the levees and dikes on the east side were built up to meet the overall plan while the corresponding levees on the west side of the river were not built up, and the result has been that these sections of St. Louis, which is North St. Louis, along the river, and South St. Louis have, in effect, had the water which would normally have gone over into the flood areas of Illinois pouring over into the industrial areas of the city of St. Louis. In my opinion, we should never go down the river one side at a time. We ought to go down the river on both sides. For that reason, it is most urgent that this project, which should have been built many years ago, be given consideration by the House as promptly as possible. Anything this size, of course, is going to take many, many years to build and any appropriations for it would cover a period of many years.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 32, line 2, immediately before the first comma, insert "exclusive of the Perry Dam."

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not take too much time on this, having explained my position during general debate.

This dam proposed at Perry, Kans., is one of a number of dams that is supposedly intended to prevent floods on the Kaw River. This Congress and previous Congresses have authorized flood-control programs that are well underway.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Does the gentleman's amendment merely take out the Perry Dam and not the Milford Dam?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I have two amendments.

Mr. MACK of Washington. You are taking out the Perry Dam by this amendment, and by a later amendment the Milford Dam?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. That is right. I have here a picture of the Delaware River, only a hundred miles long; 922 square miles; one-sixtieth part of the Kansas River Basin that we are trying to dam up in order to protect some of the cities down below. Already this Congress has provided a program of

flood prevention above this dam that is already under way. The pilot watersheds that you authorized in the 82d Congress and for which you appropriated money in the first session of this Congress, are already under construction in this particular area. Many of those dams are in process of construction. Two of them are already completed. So well are they doing the job, so much better than anyone thought, that the soil-conservation officials in our area are staging one of the biggest celebrations for the 18th of next month, to show what these dams will do. When a matter of \$60 million is under consideration in 5 or 10 minutes' time, perhaps it is something to which we should well give attention.

I wish to say that we believe that this celebration which will be staged on the 18th of next month will be attended by thousands of people from Kansas and the surrounding States. All Members of Congress are invited. Louis Bromfield will be the speaker, and we will demonstrate to the American people the new and up-to-date way of preventing floods on these rivers.

I have put this red mark down here where this dam is to go, for the reason that the people out there in my district see red every time you mention Perry Dam to them. They are convinced that there is a better way, and they are doing it.

Mr. Chairman, does it seem feasible that this Congress would provide millions of dollars for upstream flood prevention and at the same time spend additional millions at the other end when there will be no flood down there after our watershed program has been completed?

I have here a picture of a subwatershed—one of the pilot watersheds that this Congress authorized this year, under process of construction. These red marks are the dams that have been authorized by this Congress, and that are partly completed. This is dam No. 1. It was completed before the big flood that they had a month ago, and it was hardly filled. It took 2½ days for the water to go by that spillway, which otherwise would have gone by in that many hours.

I have here a letter from the county commissioner of Brown County, where this dam is located, stating that this one dam alone which is costing \$7,900 will save the county \$15,000 on one bridge.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is the product of soil conservation investigations that we have had through the years, beginning with Teddy Roosevelt, Pinchot, and coming on down to the present time.

I fully realize the considerations under which the committee has brought in a recommendation for authorization of this dam at Perry, Kans., in the low-gradient areas of the Delaware River. I was present and heard the testimony and have read the hearings.

I understand the situation of the people who have constructed gigantic industrial enterprises on the banks of the Kansas River, and of the good people who have built homes on the flat overflow

land. I have full sympathy for them and am in favor of every reasonable measure of protection in the way of dikes, flow ways, and channel improvement. I oppose the dams only because I feel that they are impracticable and antiquated, that they will not do what they are represented to do, and because there is a better way to prevent floods than by building huge dams in the river channels.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed dam at Perry, Kans., is estimated to cost \$16,263,000. We all know it will cost more than the estimate. They always do. It will permanently destroy 14,120 acres of as good farmland as there is in the United States. It is designed as one of more than a hundred dams proposed to protect Kansas City. Many competent engineers state positively that they will not do it. That is, if such a storm as we had in 1951 should occur between Topeka and Kansas City, all the dams proposed by the Corps of Engineers would not avert a flood. I have documentary evidence to substantiate all these statements.

The people of my district do not want these dams, and they so registered their convictions in the last election. This proposed dam at Perry figured in that campaign along with the dam at Tuttle Creek. Right here will you permit me to digress long enough to make it plain that the name of that stream is "Tuttle Creek," "not Turtle Creek," as some of my colleagues have mistaken it to be. If these dams should be constructed, the name could well be changed to "Turtle Creek" for that good valley would be inhabited by turtles instead of people.

In this upstream flood-prevention program, the landowner stands 50 percent of the cost; whereas in the proposed river channel big-dam program the entire cost is assessed against the Federal Government. The 82d Congress enacted a law providing for development of 62 pilot watersheds to determine the possibilities of preventing or minimizing floods by upstream watershed development. The first session of this Congress appropriated funds to implement that program. Because the Kansas River Valley is a critical flood area, 3 of these pilot projects are located in my district, and 2 of them are a part of this same Delaware River Basin where this Perry Dam is to be constructed.

Six weeks ago this area experienced one of the severest storms on record. One of the seven dams was nearing completion and it performed equal to all expectations. Floodwater that would have passed that dam site within 2 hours, without these flood-detention measures, would require 5½ days passing through the drawdown tube.

Mr. Chairman, modern machinery, American ingenuity, and a will to conquer have largely solved this flood-prevention problem so far as it can be solved. It is now possible to control the water where it falls and to keep it under control. That is the watershed program. This dam I would strike from the bill is at cross purposes with this program.

Mr. Chairman, there is yet another and very compelling reason why this

antiquated dam project should be stricken from this bill. A few weeks ago the National Rivers and Harbors Association held its annual convention in this city. President Eisenhower was invited to address the meeting. Let me quote from his speech on that occasion. These are his words:

I have become convinced that before very long America will almost unanimously look upon water as its single greatest resource.

So when a project is proposed that seems to me to be unrelated to all of the necessities of a river valley or of a slope in which it is located, I am very cold and unsympathetic. I believe that we have got to get into the Continental Divide and say—from there on down to the sea, studying where each drop of water falls—what we are going to do with it until it reaches the sea. I believe that any lesser survey of our water resources, our water uses, and our water control is completely piecemeal, and we should reject it.

I am convinced that these are some of the most memorable words spoken in American history. They may come to be the bill of rights of our water-control program. They envision exactly what is being exemplified in the pilot watershed projects scattered over the Nation at this time. This amendment is in full accord with the program initiated by this Congress, and the expressed views of the President of the United States.

Summarizing, Mr. Chairman, this is the situation: Here is a river basin of 922 square miles that in times past has sometimes contributed a small part of the flood water of the Kaw basin comprising more than 60,000 square miles. Congress has provided a program of flood prevention for this small river basin to be carried out in conjunction with the landowners—a kind of home rule if you please. They are working on this program. This is the kind of program the people believe in.

Someone not in the district wants a different kind of big dam program. The people do not believe in it, and object to it. The question before the House is: Are we going to force it upon them? The answer is "No." Vote "yes" on the amendment.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. Chairman, in 1951, immediately following the billion-dollar flood in the Kansas-Kaw Basin, many members of the Public Works Committee visited the disaster area. We saw mud 2 to 3 feet deep in the streets. We saw thousands of homes filled with muck and mud, with women inside these houses shoveling the mud out. We saw davenport, overstuffed furniture, and even grand pianos thrown into the streets for the garbage-men to come and get. They were beyond repair or reclaiming. We saw grain elevators damaged. We saw tens of thousands of acres covered with 2 to 4 feet of sand.

We were told by the United States Army engineers that they blew the carcasses of 10,000 animals out of the tree-tops. The animals had landed in the

trees during high water and then died of starvation or exhaustion. That one flood, Mr. Chairman, in that valley occasioned more than a billion dollars worth of damage, according to estimates of the United States Army engineers.

Members of the Public Works Committee who saw the horror and the damage of that flood were convinced that something ought to be done to prevent a recurrence of disasters of that magnitude.

During the present Congress the Army engineers came before us and recommended the idea of large reservoirs as the best known means to prevent future floods in this area.

Mr. Chairman, a large reservoir always is a controversial matter. It is a controversial issue because those who live above the reservoir do not want it built. The floods in the upper reaches of a river where the reservoir goes are usually not very severe and usually do not cause great damage. It is downstream where the cities are inundated by floodwaters that the great damage occurs. The people downstream desire flood control that will give them protection. The downstream people are for the big reservoirs.

When we go into a hearing on the big-reservoir idea thousands of people write to the committee protesting the big reservoirs. They are the people who live in the upper reaches of the river and who are little damaged by the floods. Down below equally large numbers of people write the committee urging that the large reservoirs be built in order to provide them flood protection.

The proposal here is that we build 2 dams, the Millford Dam and the Perry Dam, at a cost of approximately \$55 million and that also we build protective works around 9 cities, those works to cost a total of \$25 million.

The engineers testified that if we built the dikes, and did not provide the large reservoirs, that the dikes would be deathtraps. The engineers testified that the dikes around the large cities would be of no value whatsoever unless the reservoirs also were built. The engineers testified that they could not stop the floods by building small dams far up in the upper reaches of the river, as done in the soil-conservation program.

It is true that these 2 proposed dams will inundate 30,000 acres of land. There is one small village of 500 where the people complained against the dam because, they said, 30,000 acres would be taken out of cultivation and the town would lose customers for its stores.

Sixteen cities, the largest cities in the area affected by floods, sent representatives to a district meeting to discuss the merits of this proposal. That meeting of the representatives of 16 cities voted 15 to 1 in favor of the construction of the big reservoirs. The committee heard testimony by a very competent engineer, one who was very highly recommended to us, who said that in order to secure flood control in an area like this would require the building of from 900 to 1,000 small dams instead of 2 large dams. He testified it would cost \$140 an acre to secure flood-control pro-

tection from small dams against \$50 an acre to obtain the same protection from the large-dam idea. On the basis of the evidence submitted, the Flood Control Committee is unanimously of the opinion that these two dams should be authorized as recommended by the Army engineers. The committee believes these dams will give protection to the hundreds of thousands of people who live downstream.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] may extend his remarks in the RECORD following those of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I shall make will apply equally to Milford Dam and Perry Dam. From the explanation given by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], it is quite evident that this committee, which has done such a splendid job, did not overlook or have any facts escape their attention, but it shows that the proponents of these dams, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] said, proved their case.

Mr. Chairman, of course, Milford and Perry will not do the job alone, but those two dams are part of an integral program of reservoirs and local protective works which has been developed and is being developed. They are an essential and necessary key in that program, without which the local protective works lose most, if not all, of their value.

Somebody has said that there is nothing deader than the headlines in last week's newspaper. But I hope the time never comes when this Congress or any other group of Americans will ever forget the headlines such as this one in the Kansas City Star which they saw on black Friday, July 13, 1951, when the greatest flood in all history came down the Kansas River Valley, sweeping down across the farms and towns and into the two Kansas Cities and on down to St. Louis; a flood which created the most havoc and devastation ever known in the flood history of the United States.

Here is another headline of a similar character from my hometown paper, the Kansas City Kansan. If you think it was not of nationwide importance, here is the headline of the Washington Evening Star, and you know it must have been a devastating flood to get that kind of a headline in this metropolitan area.

I could tell you many, many things about that flood. Heartbreaks, yes, they were there, ruined homes, wrecked businesses, and flooded fields. I would remind you that is comparatively small number of people in the upper reaches who oppose these dams will be paid every single solitary dime of loss that they suffer in the taking of their farms or their homes, whereas those of us downstream pay all of the losses ourselves, taking on a load of debt. Nobody helps us out as much as a single nickel, despite efforts made to bring them some relief.

I would remind you that in this flood of 1951, 25 lives were lost, \$725 million

worth of damage done in Kansas City, and many more millions down in Missouri. Talk about a few thousand acres being flooded to make a reservoir. Eight hundred and ninety-two thousand acres were flooded in this one disaster, and we get them almost every year, thought not this serious. Ten thousand farms were flooded, 116 towns, 22,000 homes, 5,000 places of business felt the force of the ruinous torrents. Ninety thousand people were run out of their homes. The loss was more than a billion and a half dollars. Uncle Sam's Treasury suffered a loss in taxes more than a third of a billion—more than 5 times the cost of these 2 proposed dams. In my hometown of Kansas City, Kans., 7,500 acres were inundated, \$300 million damage was suffered, and 17,000 people driven out of their homes in the middle of the night, saving only what they could carry.

Fifty-seven hundred homes were flooded and less than one-third of them are rebuildable. Five thousand or more people had to live in trailers and other makeshift shelter while they found other space. The loss of income alone ran \$360,000 a day. Their courage has been great. In confidence that relief from floods would come, they have rebuilt.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole the words of Edward R. Murrow after he had seen this area 4 months after the occurrence. Here is what he said.

This need not have happened: It wasn't a tornado or a war which men are unable to control. It was done by a couple of rivers, and we know that rivers can be controlled. It costs a lot of money, and when a flood hits, as it did here, most of the country is not really aware of it—no matter how good or accurate the reporting may be. Some of the people who live right here didn't realize what had happened down in the flats till they went down to look. I had read and heard as much about that flood as most people because news is my business, but I was wholly unprepared for what I saw, even 4 months after the water subsided. If everyone who has to vote on flood-control dams and reservoirs could look at this result, we might put in motion the means of preventing a repetition.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this bill without these amendments will justify the faith of these courageous Kansans in their Congress.

With them it is not a matter of debate over the merits of little or big dams—with them it is a matter of survival. It is a matter of—yes—life and death.

Mr. Chairman, this program is the means, and the only means, of preventing the repetition not only of the damage which has been so catastrophic that words of man cannot even start to describe it, but also the annual recurring losses in the Kaw Valley.

I sincerely trust that the entire House will support the judgment of the committee and retain these dams in this program by defeating the amendment.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gen-

tleman on his fight for flood control and on his excellent description of the situation in the flood of 1951. My district adjoins his. I would like to corroborate everything he said and urge that this amendment be defeated because the construction of these dams proposed by the Committee on Public Works is needed if we are to control floods of this kind in his district and in mine.

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret having to disagree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER]. I often agree with him, but in this particular case I believe him mistaken, honestly so of course, and certainly representing the people of his district to the very best of his ability.

We must have soil conservation, upstream dams, and reforestation as he said but also we must have big dams.

The district which it is my privilege to represent in Kansas City, Mo., was seriously damaged by the great flood of 1951. I believe that it is absolutely essential if this great metropolitan area which includes Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., as well as other cities and towns, is to have adequate protection from floods, that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] be defeated. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

I know of no project that has given more trouble to the Committee on Appropriations than the Missouri River. Every year we have about an equal number of people who come before us who are for the project and another group who are against appropriating the money for the project. Things got so bad that it seemed that everybody who came before us thought that he was an engineer.

I remember well when we were going to put the new roof on this building and remodel this room. I said on that occasion that I never knew we had so many engineers in the House of Representatives. This is another affair like that, but I want to tell you that when a Representative comes here from a district for the first time as a member of his party, and a member of the party that always held the district was defeated, and the defeated one was for this problem last time, it seems to me that the man who came here must have had at least the endorsement of the people whom he represents.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. These two dams now under discussion had nothing whatsoever to do with that election.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know whether they did or not, but I have been told that this one did. I have been told that it

was the point at issue. I know from my own experience as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for a great number of years that this has been a very controversial subject. We ordered a special group of engineers to make a study of it the last time. When somebody says, "I don't want \$16 million spent in my district," as a member of the Appropriations Committee I can hear that phrase.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 32, line 11, at the end thereof add the following: "Provided, That authorization or authorizations herein shall not include the projects described as Pomona Reservoir and Melvern Reservoir on the Osage River and described in said Document No. 549, 81st Congress."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to agree with everything that has been said of the horrible and sad situation concerning the floods at Kansas City and Topeka, Kans. Also at Ottawa, Kans. You can hardly overdescribe that terrible disaster that has been so well described and dramatized by those who have spoken before me. There are a number of other towns in our State where the people suffered almost as much as those already mentioned. Many heroic deeds were performed by the people of those towns. Not only that but it is almost unbelievable how the people in these towns took hold, and with little or no assistance made such comeback that is almost a miracle. It is possible that flood controls or dams could have been of some assistance.

I should remind you that this amendment has nothing to do with the proposed projects on the Kansas River also known as the Kaw River. These projects in this amendment are near each other, are at the head of the Marias Des Cygnes River. It does not flow near Kansas City. It empties, as I have told you, into the Missouri River near Jefferson City, Mo.

These 2 projects are 2 of 9 proposed projects on that stream and are at the head of it. As I have stated they are on a comparatively small stream. The stream does overflow at times. Much of the soil is eroding as it is doing in many places. Much of the land is rather flat. When there are floods the water spreads out in the valley.

Engineers differ in opinion as to amount of good that would be accomplished if these projects had been built when the 1951 flood occurred. They all agree the flooding of towns below would not have been prevented, but might have been lowered.

Without repeating too much of what I have said earlier, I feel you can withhold the authorization of this expenditure of \$50 million until these people have been given a chance to develop the watershed and soil conservation program that is presently under way. It will continue in line with legislation recently

approved by this Congress. Pilot projects are built and others are being built at the present time. They consist of a series of smaller reservoirs where the landowners share in the expense.

These projects are built under the supervision and approval of engineers of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I feel these landowners should be encouraged, not discouraged. I think also, we might give consideration to opinions of engineers of the Department of Agriculture. And, above all, give some consideration to the voices of 4,000 American citizens who are disturbed concerning our action here today.

Mr. Chairman, it will not injure your program to withhold these two comparatively small projects—but large to those involved—and let them be carefully examined after the present program, now under way, has been given a chance to function.

I agree there are many places where reservoirs should be built. These are, in my opinion, unique in character. Let us keep them out of this bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not pleasant to oppose amendments that are proposed by one's friends. The Committee on Flood Control, however, is unanimously of the opinion that this project should be carried out as outlined in this bill. I represent here today the unanimous views of the subcommittee on flood control, including my own.

In 1938, the Army engineers suggested and the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives approved the construction of three dams in this area. These were the Ocoola, the Pomme de Terre, and the South Grand. Objection was made by the State of Missouri to the construction of the Ocoola Dam. As a result of these objections, a commission was created composed of representatives of the United States Army Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, and the State of Missouri, with financial aid from the State of Kansas. This Commission made a survey of the whole situation in the Kansas-Osage Valley. The Commission issued a report proposing that nine dams be constructed to alleviate the floods in the Kansas and Osage River Basins. This proposal was unanimously approved by the Committee on Public Works. It is now submitted to the Congress by this committee. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is that 2 of the proposed 9 dams be taken out of the bill, the Pomona Dam, which would cost \$12,900,000, and the Malvern Dam, which would cost \$18,800,000. The Army engineers say that these nine dams are necessary to give flood-control protection in that region. They say that soil conservation work in the upper reaches of the river valleys will not give that area the needed protection. They say that these nine dams are absolutely essential.

The Committee on Public Works was convinced that the Army engineers were giving us good advice. The committee, by unanimous vote, has recommended the construction of these nine dams, to-

gether with flood protective works at two communities. We were told by the Army engineers that if we did not build these dams, the flood-control works around the towns would be of no value in providing them protection. So the committee recommends to the House today unanimously that this project of the nine dams as outlined by the Army engineers be approved. Therefore we recommend that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, I dislike to take this time but I must point out that this is part of an integrated program. The town of Ottawa is affected more than the much smaller number of people in the district represented by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who as in all other such cases will be well paid for any losses sustained by the construction of these dams. But in 40 years this town has been hit by 39 floods. They come any time of the year. There has been only 1 month in the year when we did not have a flood in this Marais des Cygnes River and that was the month of February. The Chinese say that one picture is better than a thousand words. These pictures will conserve time. I have here a picture of the flooded city of Ottawa. Twelve thousand people live there. The flood hit Ottawa at the same time as the big flood in the Kaw River, which, of course, overshadowed it. If it had not been for the bigger flood on the Kaw, this would have made national headlines. This picture shows that the stream was 5 miles wide. It was 52 feet deep. Do you think the smaller dams will stop torrential floods which come down this valley year after year? Here is a picture taken showing Russell Crites, of Ottawa, and me standing on the dry rock bed of the Marais des Cygnes River 2 years after the flood. Not even a trickle is to be seen. This bridge you see was 9 feet under water. Had I been able to stand there at the peak of the flood I would have been 52 feet under water in that stream 5 miles wide. Here in this picture is a picture of the main downtown street in Ottawa. It is not only the city of Ottawa that is affected, but also the city of Osawatomie and the fertile fields of this valley. This program is the only salvation for those of us who live downstream and have to accept waters from the upper watersheds and the hillsides. Furthermore, after 3 years of serious drought, we know the need of storing flood waters for the days when the rains come not.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MOULDER. Is it not true that the damage caused by the annual floods in the Osage Basin amount to \$5 million?

Mr. SCRIVNER. At least that. Of course, this 1951 flood itself ran many millions of dollars more than that.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Does the gentleman realize that this plan in the bill adopts a much more modern and up-to-date program for that basin? If we accept this amendment we will continue in effect the authorization which is now out of date.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This is a modern program. The committee has done a good job in considering this. They looked at it from every angle, and this is their decision. It is a sound one. I trust the amendment will be defeated, so that we may have the protection from flood and drought that we so sorely need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 41, line 3, strike out all of section 209.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the following language from the bill:

SEC. 209. That, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, there shall be established in the civil works activities under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, 7 positions to be placed in grade GS-16 and 2 positions to be placed in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by that act.

It provides, you will see, without regard to limitation of the Classification Act, for 7 positions of supergrade 16 employees and 2 supergrade 17 employees. In other words, you ask that this agency go outside the limitations of the Classification Act and employ these additional people under supergrades.

After all, the House committee has jurisdiction of this class of legislation. This agency should know it. The matter of approving supergrades ought to be supervised by the Civil Service Commission. The legislation should remain with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Only recently our committee authorized 150 supergrade positions requested by the Civil Service Commission. The agency making the request should make its case with the Commission, and not ask your committee to approve.

If this present example is followed, other agencies will be doing the same thing. Then there will be no supervision at all.

This section should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. Chairman, this section (209) is in the bill at the request of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers handles hundred of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money every year. They represented to our committee that the best engineers of the country are no longer available to them because private industry and private business are hiring

them by offering more money than the Government of the United States. In view of that fact, they represented to us that some of the best engineers they have had through the years have left them and have gone elsewhere.

If we expect the Corps of Engineers of this country and our Government to continue the splendid work they have done for more than 125 years, certainly they are entitled to have the personnel and the kind of people who can do the work entrusted to them. That is the reason section 209 is in the bill.

If you will notice, there are only about a half a dozen upgrades requested. It is not a large demand. Whether the Corps of Engineers and this committee have overstepped their jurisdiction is another question entirely. But those are the facts behind section 209. Unless the Corps of Engineers are given this higher classification so that they can pay a reasonable amount to men who are qualified to hold these high positions, they are going to find themselves without the personnel required to do the work entrusted to them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman realize the salaries that are being created, in the 17's for example, the salaries that go with that classification?

Mr. DONDERO. I am willing to listen to the gentleman, because he is more familiar with salaries than I am.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You are agreeing in this bill to pay these people up to \$13,800 a year. They may be worth it. But if we are going to permit this committee and other committees to determine the number of classified people in 16's and 17's, I do not know where you are leading us to. That is my opinion, of course. If the House does not agree with me, very well. But it seems to me there ought to be some committee through which you funnel the number of people in these various classifications. That is the thing we have worked out and tried to perfect. Only last week after hearings we did increase the number by 150 in these classifications. Why not go to the Civil Service Commission, get their recommendation, and let that Commission come before the committee?

Mr. DONDERO. It is the position of the gentleman from Kansas that the Corps of Engineers has come to the wrong committee; it should have gone to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not object if they want to go to the gentleman's committee, but I think this matter should be under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman think the request of the Army engineers is unreasonable in this matter?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know; I have not heard their testimony. If they will come before us and give their testimony, we may determine it. I cannot find the gentleman's testimony, either.

Mr. DONDERO. The committee of which have the honor to be chairman did hear the testimony and determined,

I think unanimously, that the request was reasonable and ought to be granted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's committee is one of the greatest committees in the whole Congress, I admit that.

Mr. DONDERO. We are proud of it, and I think the House is, too.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I would like to back up the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think he has done an extraordinary job under very difficult conditions. We have found in the hearings we have held on reclassification of civil-service employees that this is a very perplexing problem.

As the chairman of the Civil Service Committee indicated, there are over 1,000 supergrades in the United States Government today. I think the proper place to get GS-16 and 17 classifications is before the Committee on Civil Service, and if the Corps of Army Engineers can back up what they want, the committee would give them a hearing in the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. If this were a large request, for a very large number, I could easily understand the gentleman's objections and also the objections of the chairman of the Civil Service Committee. But this is a small request.

Mr. BOLAND. The same argument used by the Corps of Engineers could be used by any other department of the Government. They all want supergrades. I think there ought to be a stop to it, and this is the place to stop it right here.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas be defeated and that section 209 stay in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were—ayes 65, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see H. R. 9859 before this august body here today for a vote. H. R. 9859 has had long hearings and careful study by the members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works. I want to compliment the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], for his fairness in all the hearings. Our committee is neither Republican nor Democrat. We leave our politics in the hallways outside of our committee rooms. No section of our great country has preference over another section of our country. The Committee on Public Works of the House is an all-American committee. I have served for many, many years on committees in my long legislative career, and I must say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is tops, a prince of good fellows. We, in the minority, were treated the

same as the majority. I can say the same for our good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]. He has done a real good job, worked hard and sincere; he has heard testimony for months and has always been fair. I am sorry that HOMER is not with us today. He is not feeling well enough.

All these things may be said for our good friend the gentleman from Washington, RUSSELL MACK, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control. I think the gentleman from Washington, RUSSELL MACK, knows more about flood control than anybody in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to serve on the Committee on Public Works of the House. They are all fine fellows; and I include the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. BUCHANAN], too. They should be complimented for their good, hard work in presenting this bill, H. R. 9859, for consideration today. I hope the bill passes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Kansas: On page 32, line 2, immediately before the word "at", insert "exclusive of the Milford Dam."

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think we can make very short work of this dam. The amount is only \$38 million and we cannot afford to spend too much time on that small sum. I had been informed and believed for some time that this was an economy-minded Congress. I am not quite so sure of it now.

I do want to pay a little attention to some of the remarks that were made concerning the amendment that I presented here a few minutes ago, the amendment to strike out Perry Dam. The statement was made that there was several hundred million dollars of damage at Kansas City and Topeka, and that is true. But we are not so sure that the construction of these dams would remedy that situation.

Let me read to you from the report of the board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas to look into the Kansas River situation. This report was signed by three of the best engineers of nationwide reputation who had made a very thorough study of this entire Kaw River Basin. This is the conclusion to which they came:

Had all the 18 dams authorized or recommended including Milford and Perry been completed and operating as designed, the 1951 flood would have overtopped all the urban protection works from Manhattan to the Missouri River by from 1 to 3 feet and the damage in those areas would have been great. The cost of this program, including channels, would have been \$400 million.

What becomes of your argument that the construction of Perry Dam and Milford Dam would relieve that situation when three of the best engineer in the country say that if they had been there this flood, the like of which we wish to protect against would have overtopped them all by several feet? You would have had just as great a flood as you did

have. So your argument has gone down the river. Does it make good sense for this Congress to appropriate funds and initiate a program of flood prevention upstream and at the same time, while we are doing that, on the same river basin, going down to the end of the river, to the mouth of the river, and throwing across a dam that is proposed to do the very thing we are doing upstream? They tell us that it cannot be done, that it will not be effective.

Is it not true that every watershed is composed of subwatersheds, and if you can control the floods on the river, can you not control them all the more easily on the creeks? That is what we are doing. The river basin is only the sum of the creek basins that go to make it up.

I will not take any more of your time this evening. I do not know what you are going to do but I have a pretty good idea.

Before I leave I want to say this: The assertion was made here that these two river dams had no relationship to Tuttle Creek Dam. They did have a relationship. These people came to me in the last campaign and they voted for me because, they said: "If they authorize or appropriate for Tuttle Creek we will be next." You are proving it to them today. They are next.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I debated at great length the merits of the Perry Dam with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER]. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] had moved that the Perry Dam be stricken from the bill. The Milford Dam is similar to the Perry Dam. It serves the same purposes. Inasmuch as a majority earlier stood by the committee in keeping the Perry Dam in the bill, we hope for the same reason they will keep the Milford Dam in the bill. I call for a vote on the amendment. I hope the gentleman's amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, of the many worthwhile projects included in this omnibus bill—H. R. 9859—now before us, there is one in particular which I feel warrants special attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

This is the second item enumerated in the bill and deals with the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire.

Our great Portsmouth Naval Base which is extremely vital to the national defense lies at the mouth of the Piscataqua River (the lower portion of the river is known as Portsmouth Harbor). Except for three rock ledges which this project seeks to remove, the Piscataqua River would be a deep draft navigable stream approximately 13 miles upstream from the Portsmouth Naval Base. Today the vessels stopping at this great naval base must be exceedingly

cautious and careful because of the first of the three rock ledges.

As the Committee on Public Works stated in House Report 2247:

Particularly hazardous navigational difficulties prevail at the three submerged ledges at which improvements are recommended. Their removal would permit safer navigation and maneuvering, particularly for deep draft vessels of 10,000 tons or more.

The House Public Works Committee thoroughly inspected the Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River last August. It is my sincere belief that this is one of the most worthwhile and deserving projects we visited.

Portsmouth Harbor and the Piscataqua River has a natural channel 70 feet deep in places and at the shallow points about 40 feet.

The amount asked for in the bill for Portsmouth is \$952,000 and the point I wish to emphasize is that the improvements in the harbor and the Piscataqua River will be permanent. This harbor never freezes. There is no silting because of the swiftness of the river. Once the rock obstructions are removed, nothing more needs to be done. The harbor is protected and easily accessible. With the removal of these rocks the large tankers and the largest boats used in coastwise shipping would have an easy access to the harbor and the river.

After listening to evidence presented from various witnesses and the United States Corps of Engineers in connection with this project, and after personally inspecting the harbor, I am thoroughly convinced that the States of Maine and New Hampshire need these improvements and I am certain that tremendous economic development will follow the completion of the project. There is illimitable opportunity for marked industrial development. This I am sure would follow if boats could go in and out without being damaged.

When we reflect that the New England taxpayers have helped to provide the billions of dollars appropriated by the Congress for the subsidization of electric power in other sections of the country, this item of \$952,000 seems small indeed compared to the economic stability and well-being which this project will help to create. It will help to offset the previous migration of industries from this New England area to those which have been provided with federally subsidized electric power. It will enhance the growing and expanding economy of our Nation as well as providing for the national defense of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Hampshire's First Congressional District, Representative CHESTER E. MERROW is to be complimented for his active and intelligent leadership in bringing this important matter to the attention of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and later to the attention of the whole committee. Congressman MERROW has served his congressional district for six terms. It was largely because of his work and concerted effort that the Committee on Public Works visited the Granite State. Both as host to the committee last summer when visiting his district, and on

his several appearances before sessions of the House Public Works Committee, he has proved to be a splendid Representative of New Hampshire and a great statesman. He has always held to the pertinent facts in his persevering campaign for this great project. I am delighted for him, for his district, and the Nation that this project will become a reality—it will long remain a great monument to him.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on its approval of the project in the sum of \$8½ million for the deepening of the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River.

The 40-foot channel which now exists there had been adequate in the past years, but with the increase in the size of shipping, it has become quite inadequate in recent years. The port of Portland carries a tremendous load of shipping and is constantly growing. Without the improvement of the river bar, much of this future growth might be stunted.

It is a worthwhile project, and one which I am sure the House as a whole will approve.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 643, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk is authorized to correct section numbers.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6080) to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "Columbia" insert "for credit to the Highway Fund."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "not to exceed \$475,000" and insert "the sum of \$290,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE GOLD COAST AND NIGERIA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 648) to extend greetings to the Gold Coast and Nigeria.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward independence and self-government truly expressive of the desires of the people and as they show their capability to establish and protect free institutions; and

Whereas the continent of Africa is a vital part of the free world area; and

Whereas a revised constitution of the Gold Coast was approved on April 29, 1954, and the first formal meeting of the legislature of that territory under this constitution will take place on July 29, 1954; and

Whereas a revised constitution of Nigeria is expected to be approved during August 1954, and the first meeting of the federal legislature of that territory under this constitution is expected to take place shortly thereafter; and

Whereas these occasions mark important milestones in their progress toward self-government and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States extend its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under the revised constitutions, in recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the United States and those territories, and in reaffirmation of the friendship of the United

States for the peoples of Africa; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete self-government for these territories.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution extends on behalf of the House of Representatives its most cordial greetings to the legislative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria on the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under their revised constitution, and in addition authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint a United States delegation at the appropriate time to represent the United States at ceremonies marking the achievement of complete self-government for these territories.

On April 29, 1954, a new constitution was approved for the Gold Coast which brings it to the threshold of sovereign independence. Under it an all-African government with almost complete responsibility for the country's internal affairs has been established. Elections based on universal adult suffrage were held June 10-15, 1954, under the new constitution: The Convention People's Party won 72 of the 104 seats of the new legislative assembly and, on June 17, 1954, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, chairman of the Convention People's Party accepted the offer of the Gold Coast Governor to become Prime Minister and to form a new government. The Prime Minister, educated at Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, was the first African ever to hold such office in any British territory.

Similarly in Nigeria, the largest of the United Kingdom territories with a population of 31.5 million, a revised federal constitution representing the will of the people as expressed through their leaders is expected to be approved next month. The new constitution will give the 3 regions of Nigeria greater autonomy and will carry 2 of the 3 regions a considerable toward self-government. Supplementing these moves toward independence, the United Kingdom has declared that in 1956 they will be prepared to grant full self-government to any region that may wish it in respect to those subjects that are a regional responsibility. Nnamdi Azikwe, who recently visited the United States, will become Prime Minister of the eastern region. Like his Gold Coast counterpart, he, too, is an alumnus of Lincoln University and a respected leader of nationalist movements throughout western Africa.

Our Nation's policy encourages legitimate efforts toward independence and self-government among those peoples in former colonial and underdeveloped areas who demonstrate a desire and a

capacity to establish and protect free institutions. Accordingly, official cognizance should be taken of the momentous events that are now happening in western Africa. At a time when man's natural will to be free is thwarted in many parts of the world by the subversion practiced by Communists under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist regime, the significance of recent developments in the Gold Coast and Nigeria looms very large for the free world's success.

Since the British acquisition of the territories now comprising the Gold Coast and Nigeria during the 19th century, vast changes have been wrought there. From primitive tribal cultures these territories have now advanced to a degree of social and political maturity that should soon allow them to assume their rightful places among the free nations of the world.

It is entirely fitting that the House of Representatives should extend its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of the Gold Coast and Nigeria upon the occasion of the first meeting of their legislatures under their revised constitutions, and that the Secretary of State be requested to appoint a delegation to represent the United States at the ceremonies which will mark the achievement of complete independence for these territories. Such acts are fitting recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the United States and these areas and are a reaffirmation of the friendship of the United States for the peoples of Africa.

(Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. JAVITS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

[Mr. GORDON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, when the bill H. R. 9757 was before the House today, I voted against the motion to recommit. However, I was absent during the rollcall on the final passage and if I had been present, I would have voted for the bill.

RE-REFERENCE OF BILLS TO COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bills 3655, 3506, and 1585 be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. REED of New York submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2543)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8300) to revise the internal revenue laws of the United States, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 10a, 12 (4), 41a, 41b, 57a, 67a, 74a, 110, 129a, 141a, 154, 155, 178, 179, 180, 185a, 220a, 271b, 273a, 281a, 413a, 485a, 486 (1), 486 (2), 486 (3), 494, and 551.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 (1), 1 (2), 2 (1), 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 (1), 12 (2), 12 (3), 12 (5), 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 (2), 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 (1), 23 (2), 23 (4), 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 34a, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 61a, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 67b, 68 (1), 68 (4), 69, 70, 71, 72, 73 (2), 74, 75, 76, 76a, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85 (1), 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93 (2), 94, 95, 96 (1), 97, 98, 100, 102 (2), 102a, 103, 105, 105a, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156 (1), 156 (2), 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163 (1), 163 (3), 163 (4), 164, 165 (1), 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186 (2), 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220 (1), 220 (2), 220 (3), 220 (4), 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227 (2), 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 232a, 232b, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 253a, 254, 255, 256, 257, 260, 261, 262, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 301a, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 379a, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 406a, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 466a, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486 (4), 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 495, 496, 497, 498, 498a, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515,

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9859

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

4 SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of
5 rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood
6 control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and author-
7 ized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary
8 of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in
9 accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions

1 recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective
2 reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provi-
3 sions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved
4 March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Con-
5 gress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects
6 authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth
7 with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of
8 improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
9 tion and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein
10 set forth in full:

11 Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered
12 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

13 Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and
14 New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-
15 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

16 Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash
19 the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the
20 Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently
21 estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

22 Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$4,400,000;

25 Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document

1 Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$525,000;

3 Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
4 bered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$375,000;

6 Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document
7 Numbered 405, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$694,000;

9 Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document
10 Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$166,400;

12 Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Num-
13 bered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in
15 cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently
16 estimated as \$23,000;

17 Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Num-
18 bered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$135,000;

20 Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut:
21 House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$112,500;

23 Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$32,200;

1 Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered
2 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$31,928,000;

4 Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House
5 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an
6 estimated cost of \$138,000;

7 Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document
8 Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$1,973,900;

10 Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Num-
11 bered 229, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$469,400;

13 Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake
14 Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered
15 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,-
16 000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution
17 for the construction of all bridges, including approaches
18 thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard
19 heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

20 Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document
21 Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
22 of \$31,900;

23 Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Mary-
24 land: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

1 Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland:
2 House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$29,000;

4 Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland:
5 House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at
6 an estimated cost of \$192,600;

7 Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House
8 Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
9 mated cost of \$20,300;

10 Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Num-
11 bered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required
13 of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs
14 between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

15 Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland:
16 House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$45,100;

18 Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Num-
19 bered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$678,300;

21 Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay,
22 Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second
23 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

24 Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered
25 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

1 Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia:
2 Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at
3 an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

4 Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Docu-
5 ment Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
6 cost of \$95,000;

7 Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered
8 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

9 Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina:
10 House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$108,000;

12 Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Num-
13 bered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$102,000;

15 Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson
16 Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411,
17 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

18 Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Water-
19 way: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Con-
20 gress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

21 Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina:
22 House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at
23 an estimated cost of \$765,000;

1 Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered
2 110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;

3 Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Docu-
4 ment Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
5 mated cost of \$82,200;

6 Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered
7 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;

8 Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
9 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
10 \$98,000;

11 Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George
12 Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second
13 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

14 St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
15 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$1,312,000;

17 Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered
18 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$5,778,000;

20 Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Num-
21 bered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$70,000;

23 Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Docu-

1 ment Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$520,000;

3 Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document
4 Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
5 of \$6,875,000;

6 Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document
7 Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$74,300;

9 Aransas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intra-
10 coastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

12 Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

14 Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House
15 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already per-
17 formed by local interests on this project, in accordance with
18 recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribu-
19 tion required of local interests;

20 Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
22 mated cost of \$82,600;

23 Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document
24 Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$65,000;

1 Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House
2 Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
3 mated cost of \$142,000;

4 Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate
5 Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a
6 monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of
7 the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document
8 Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland
9 River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", au-
10 thorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is
11 hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment
12 of the project hereby approved;

13 Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Docu-
14 ment Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
15 cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system
16 work;

17 Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document
18 Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional esti-
19 mated cost of \$219,900;

20 Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Num-
21 bered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$220,000;

23 Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document

1 Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$217,200;

3 Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Num-
4 bered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25
6 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to
7 exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required
8 by the project document;

9 Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Docu-
10 ment Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
11 mated cost of \$225,000;

12 Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

14 Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Num-
15 bered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$174,000;

17 Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New
18 York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Con-
19 gress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

20 Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New
21 York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Con-
22 gress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;

23 Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$2,459,000;

1 Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California:
2 House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress,
3 at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secre-
4 tary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local
5 interests for such work as they may have done upon this
6 project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests
7 insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers and found to have been done in accordance with the
9 project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such re-
10 imbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable
11 thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take pre-
12 cedence over other pending projects of higher priority for
13 harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such
14 payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

15 Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California:
16 House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress:
17 *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of
18 entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and cen-
19 tral basin recommended in the project report and presently
20 estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum
21 of the cost thereof;

22 Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered
23 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$5,437,000;

25 Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate

1 Document Numbered 83, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
2 mated cost of \$3,758,700;

3 Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reeds-
4 port, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-
5 first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

6 Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington:
7 House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

9 Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the
10 head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

12 Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washing-
13 ton: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Con-
14 gress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

15 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House
16 Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
17 mated cost of \$421,800;

18 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Break-
19 water), Washington: House Document Numbered —,
20 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$323,700;

21 Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Num-
22 bered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
23 \$179,300;

24 Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered

1 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
2 \$139,250;

3 Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document
4 Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
5 cost of \$1,366,650;

6 Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Num-
7 bered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
8 \$436,000;

9 Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document
10 Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$3,397,300;

12 Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document
13 Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$477,900;

15 Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington:
16 House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$395,500;

18 Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Num-
19 bered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$425,550;

21 Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
22 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

23 Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
24 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

1 Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$3,022,000;

4 BEACH EROSION

5 Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document
6 Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
7 of \$140,000;

8 Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
9 Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
10 of \$189,000;

11 Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
12 bered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$402,900;

14 Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
15 Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
16 cost of \$409,000;

17 South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document
18 Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$166,550;

20 Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecti-
21 cut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress,
22 at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach;
23 \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

24 New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3),

1 Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect
3 Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf
4 Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

5 Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut:
6 House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at
7 an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000
8 for Seaside Park;

9 Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
10 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
11 \$2,044,000;

12 Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
13 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$105,000;

15 Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey:
16 House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at
17 an estimated cost of \$260,000;

18 Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered
19 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

20 Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered
21 380, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

22 Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Num-
23 bered 28, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
24 \$1,176,400;

1 Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Docu-
2 ment Numbered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
3 cost of \$185,000;

4 Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Num-
5 bered 502, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
6 \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White
7 City Park;

8 Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House
9 Document Numbered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an
10 estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

11 Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York:
12 House Document Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at
13 an estimated cost of \$136,500;

14 Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House
15 Document Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$3,874,000;

17 Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document
18 Numbered 349, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
19 of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

20 Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Docu-
21 ment Numbered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
22 cost of \$73,700;

23 Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document
24 Numbered 227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$283,700.

1 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
2 ized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them
3 on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, sub-
4 sequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which
5 form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work
6 which may have been done on these projects was approved
7 by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
8 projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reim-
9 bursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable there-
10 to for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence
11 over other pending projects of higher priority for improve-
12 ments.

13 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
14 ized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and
15 survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from
16 the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, in the
17 vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable pro-
18 visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

19 SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to
20 the city of Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their
21 successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend
22 Channel, in the county of Mobile, Alabama, by the construc-
23 tion and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said
24 channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama:

1 *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be com-
2 menced until the plans and location therefor have been filed
3 with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States
4 Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision
5 shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the
6 causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years
7 and completed within five years from the date of this Act and
8 the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby
9 expressly reserved.

10 SEC. 105. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor
11 Act of 1954".

12 TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

13 SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22,
14 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
15 amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938
16 (Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall
17 apply to all works authorized in this title except that for
18 any channel improvement or channel rectification project,
19 provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of
20 June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise
21 provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any
22 flood-control project herein adopted requiring local coopera-
23 tion shall expire five years from the date on which local
24 interests are notified in writing by the Department of the
25 Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said

1 interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory
2 to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation
3 will be furnished.

4 SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of
5 December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-
6 eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to
7 projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein
8 set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works
9 of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
10 tion and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein
11 set forth in full.

12 It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress
13 that the following provisions shall be observed:

14 No project or any modification not authorized, of a proj-
15 ect for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized
16 by the Congress unless a report for such project or modifica-
17 tion has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers,
18 United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

19 SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the
20 benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-
21 waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized
22 to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the
23 Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in ac-
24 cordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-
25 after designated and subject to the conditions set forth

1 therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications,
2 and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project
3 authorized in this title with funds from appropriations here-
4 tofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready
5 for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*
6 *further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated
7 as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be con-
8 sistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*,
9 That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible
10 future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall
11 be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construc-
12 tion by the Department of the Army when approved by
13 the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the
14 Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

15 CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

16 That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecti-
17 cut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936
18 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
19 amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide
20 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of
21 the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers,
22 of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene,
23 New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs here-
24 tofore authorized.

1 That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecti-
2 cut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three
3 reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend
4 sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in
5 section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December
6 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to
7 by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers,
8 and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in
9 June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the
10 eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control
11 Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

12 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

13 The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity
14 of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby
15 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
16 tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-
17 bered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$4,469,000.

19 CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

20 The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood
21 control and other purposes in central and southern Florida
22 given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as
23 amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the

1 entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended
2 by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered
3 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof
4 as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the dis-
5 cretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Pro-*
6 *vided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the author-
7 ized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control
8 Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all
9 work over and beyond that previous authorization such
10 conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they
11 shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress,
12 based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest
13 practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the
14 Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*,
15 That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established
16 by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be
17 retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan author-
18 ized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment
19 of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided*
20 *further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is
21 hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000
22 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

23

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

24

25

The project for flood control and improvement of the
lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15,

1 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified
2 and expanded to include the following items of work and the
3 authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

4 (a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock
5 for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of
6 the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated
7 February 2, 1954, as concurred in by the report of the Chief
8 of Engineers dated April 8, 1954, with such modifications
9 as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable
10 at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation
11 lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000 in-
12 crease in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under
13 the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the
14 Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which
15 \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this
16 paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire
17 such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be
18 necessary for construction of the project except that local
19 interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the
20 Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended,
21 with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main
22 line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by
24 the United States in connection with this item: *And pro-*
25 *vided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the

1 required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engi-
2 neers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds
3 herein authorized to be appropriated.

4 (b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Missis-
5 sippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City,
6 Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the
7 Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53,
8 Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of
9 \$440,000.

10 (c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicks-
11 burg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report
12 of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85,
13 Eighty-third Congress.

14 (d) Modification of the authorized project for the New
15 Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the rec-
16 ommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document
17 Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
18 of \$1,743,000.

19 BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEXAS

20 The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide
21 flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as author-
22 ized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939,
23 and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in ac-
24 cordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third
2 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

3 BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

4 The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the
5 Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek,
6 Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
7 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
8 Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there
9 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,-
10 000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

11 GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

12 The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and
13 San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substan-
14 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
15 Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third
16 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

17 GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

18 The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas,
19 authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act author-
20 izing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain
21 public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes",
22 approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such au-
23 thorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and
24 Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction,

1 operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secre-
2 tary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers
3 of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the
4 provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir
5 shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approx-
6 imately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which
7 three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for
8 flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood con-
9 trol, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for
10 sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of develop-
11 ment of electric power, at an estimated total cost of
12 \$13,300,000.

13 The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Fed-
14 eral Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate
15 to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation,
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may
17 appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-
18 flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such
19 allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable
20 costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net
21 increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage
22 capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and
23 Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation.
24 No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for

1 development of electric power shall be made under this sec-
2 tion unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such in-
3 stallation will actually be constructed.

4 The costs allocated to local interests under this section
5 shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by
6 them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act.
7 The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engi-
8 neers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon
9 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the
10 appropriation available for maintenance and operation of
11 such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such
12 operation and maintenance ; the \$1,400,000 to be con-
13 tributed during the construction period shall be deposited to
14 the credit of the appropriation available for construction of
15 the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that pur-
16 pose ; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief
17 of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon
18 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of
19 the United States.

20 Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon
21 Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by
22 the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance
23 with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accord-
24 ance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, opera-

1 tion, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local
2 interests and with such power to be made available to such
3 local interests.

4 Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward
5 the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir,
6 \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time
7 or times during the period of such construction, as the
8 Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the
9 contributions allocated to local interests under section 2, with
10 interest thereon at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per annum,
11 shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over
12 a period not in excess of fifty years.

13 The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement
14 with local interests providing for the payments heretofore
15 described and for all other matters relating to the operation
16 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which
17 require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement
18 may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water
19 conservation and stream-flow regulation for development
20 of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide
21 that the utilization of water for power development shall not
22 be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimenta-
23 tion purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized sub-

1 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
2 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185,
3 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

4 UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

5 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River
6 in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized sub-
7 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
8 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397,
9 Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of
10 \$2,500,000.

11 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River,
12 Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby au-
13 thorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
14 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
15 Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the
16 improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Hen-
17 derson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost
18 for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

19 The project for flood protection on the Missis-
20 sippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8,
21 Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially
22 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
23 Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third
24 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

1 The project on the Mississippi River for local flood
2 protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illi-
3 nois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
4 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
5 Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
6 mated cost of \$7,046,300.

7 The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa
8 River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance
9 with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
10 Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an
11 estimated cost of \$979,600.

12 MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

13 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
14 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for
15 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri
16 River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers,
17 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and
18 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

19 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
20 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
21 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
22 project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tribu-
23 taries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in
24 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Con-
2 gress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and
3 there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition
4 to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

5 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
6 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
7 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
8 project for flood protection on the Osage River and tribu-
9 taries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with
10 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House
11 Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

12 The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June
13 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys,
14 Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood
15 Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modi-
16 fied to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute
17 not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of
18 flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the
19 lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Pro-*
20 *vided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal
21 Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of
22 the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor
23 shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project
24 reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-
25 of-way, and public relocations which local interests would

1 have been required to bear had the approved Government
2 plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total
3 amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the
4 work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

5 The project for flood protection on the Chariton River,
6 Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in
7 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
8 neers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Con-
9 gress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

10 The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux
11 River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is
12 hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accord-
13 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers,
14 in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress,
15 at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

16 The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri
17 River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby
18 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
19 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Num-
20 bered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
21 \$212,300.

22 COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

23 The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and
24 tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in
25 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second
2 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

3 OHIO RIVER BASIN

4 The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek
5 at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is
6 hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the
7 recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Docu-
8 ment Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$570,000.

10 The project for flood control and related purposes on the
11 Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substan-
12 tially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House
13 Document Numbered , Eighty-third Congress, at an
14 estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the
15 local cooperation recommended in that document, local
16 interests shall comply with the provisions of local coopera-
17 tion contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act
18 approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also con-
19 struct and maintain local drainage works required to fully
20 and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally
21 as outlined in House Document Numbered , Eighty-
22 third Congress.

23 KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

24 The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo
25 River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized sub-

stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California, approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

1 The plan of improvement for flood control on the Ameri-
2 can River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in
3 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
4 neers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

6 LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

7 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
8 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for
9 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower
10 San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of
11 December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by sub-
12 sequent Acts of Congress.

13 COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

14 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
15 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for
16 the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia
17 River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was author-
18 ized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and
19 these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power
20 development in the following projects in tributary basins, sub-
21 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
22 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531,
23 Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of
24 McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on
25 Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White

1 Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam
2 River, Oregon.

3 TERRITORY OF ALASKA

4 The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tribu-
5 taries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-
6 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in
7 House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress,
8 at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

9 TERRITORY OF HAWAII

10 The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream
11 and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii,
12 is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-
13 ommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
14 Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
15 of \$347,000.

16 SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
17 ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and sur-
18 veys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel
19 and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by
20 or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction
21 of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United
22 States and its Territorial possessions, which include the fol-
23 lowing-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or
24 formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or
25 work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no

1 supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made
2 unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the
3 Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to
4 be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such
5 review is required by the national defense or by changed
6 physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the
7 Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any
8 project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor
9 mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed
10 work shall have been adopted by law:

11 Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

12 Neponset River, Massachusetts.

13 Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Penn-
14 sylvania in the interest of flood control.

15 Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

16 Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

17 Coos Bay, Oregon.

18 SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the
19 sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated
20 for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the
21 prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be
22 carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of
23 December 22, 1944, as amended.

24 SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August
25 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Con-

gress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

“That 75 per centum of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein.”

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

“That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as

1 required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter
2 made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related pur-
3 poses by the United States, for the establishment, operation,
4 and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of
5 recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as
6 the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the
7 Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau
8 such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary
9 examinations and surveys or works of improvement author-
10 ized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and
11 related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the
12 recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to
13 allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure.”

14 SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of
15 August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood
16 Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended
17 to read as follows:

18 “That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
19 allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations here-
20 tofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood
21 control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris,
22 and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable
23 streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the
24 Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of
25 flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall

1 be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from
2 the appropriations for any one fiscal year.”

3 SEC. 209. That section 4 of the Act approved July 24,
4 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), is
5 amended to read as follows:

6 “The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
7 Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain,
8 and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir
9 areas under the control of the Department of the Army,
10 and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation
11 of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also author-
12 ized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities
13 thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such
14 terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in
15 the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organ-
16 izations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at
17 reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the pub-
18 lic service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises:
19 *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal,
20 State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases
21 where appropriate, may be granted without monetary con-
22 siderations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion
23 of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secre-
24 tary of the Army determines such action to be in the public
25 interest, and for such periods of time and upon such con-

1 ditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That
2 in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local
3 governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for
4 the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests,
5 or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be
6 authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be neces-
7 sary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize
8 the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the develop-
9 ment, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such
10 lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid
11 to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary
12 of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas
13 of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally,
14 without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and
15 other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit
16 from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs
17 shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is
18 determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary
19 to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations
20 as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use
21 of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted
22 which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish
23 and game of the State in which such area is situated. All
24 moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges

1 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as
 2 miscellaneous receipts.”

3 SEC. 210. Title II may be cited as the “Flood Control
 4 Act of 1954”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION
OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR
NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 9859]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are indicated in the bill as reported and are shown by *linetype* and *italic*.

GENERAL STATEMENT

This is a combined omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, title I dealing with river and harbor authorizations, and title II dealing with flood-control authorizations. It is the first general authorization bill since the act of May 17, 1950. The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives has held extensive hearings on a total of more than 85 river and harbor projects, 22 beach-erosion projects and 40 flood-control projects, including some multiple-purpose projects, modifications of projects, additional basin authorizations and a few preliminary examinations and surveys. The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, testified on all projects contained in the bill. Local interests were afforded full opportunity to present their views for or against the matters under consideration.

The Committee on Public Works of the Senate has considered the bill as passed by the House and in addition, it has held hearings on other projects which were proposed for consideration subsequent to the close of the House hearings. The committee concurs in the action of the House with respect to the projects approved by that body and it recommends approval of those projects by the Senate. It has con-

sidered the additional projects upon which it held hearings, and it believes that most of them are fully justified for authorization at this time. A few were passed over without prejudice for the reason that they had not been processed to a point where adequate data could be made available for the consideration of the committee. Amendments are recommended to authorize those projects for which sufficient data and justifications were available.

This report contains descriptions of all projects and modifications recommended by the committee. Similarly, the report of the House committee, House Report No. 2247, 83d Congress, contains descriptions of all projects and modifications which are in the bill as passed by the House. Tabulations are also included in this report listing under separate titles the projects as passed by the House and those recommended by the committee.

General discussions of the river and harbor and flood-control programs are printed in House Report No. 2247. The committee concurs generally in the material presented in those discussions and it has repeated portions of them in this report for the convenience of the Senate.

A period of 4 years has elapsed since the last omnibus bill, longer than any intervening time between any preceding omnibus bills. As a result, a great number of projects were eligible for consideration. To offset the large number of projects, the committee has attempted to hold down the total monetary authorizations by judicious use of balances of monetary authorizations available in certain river basins. With respect to existing basin authorizations, the committee has adopted the principle that in those basins where deficits in authorizations are imminent, increased amounts should be granted to permit orderly continuation of the work on the assumption that the next omnibus bill would be not later than the fiscal year 1956. In some cases the committee has approved the authorization of new basin plans of considerable scope but has limited the monetary authorization to amounts needed for the immediate future. However, the increased scope of work in these new basin plans which is not covered by monetary authorization in this bill is offset by increased monetary authorizations for work under existing basin plans where there is no increase in scope.

For comparative purposes, the size of the present bill is compared with the size of the omnibus bills during the last 10 years in the following table:

Act	River and harbor	Flood control	Total
1944 Flood Control Act and 1945 River and Harbor Act.....	\$381,968,000	\$950,000,000	\$1,331,968,000
1946 Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts.....	521,295,000	772,000,000	1,293,295,000
1950 Flood Control and River and Harbor Acts.....	203,723,125	1,250,000,000	1,453,723,125

NOTE.—Table excludes 1948 act, which covered relatively few projects of an emergency nature and was not of the magnitude of the usual omnibus bill.

The committee points out that the total of the present bill is approximately \$1 billion, whereas all previous bills during the last 10 years with the exception of the small 1948 bill which was fundamentally of an emergency nature, were appreciably in excess of \$1 billion. If increases in the general price level were taken into

account, the relative reduction in the size of this bill would be much more marked.

The estimated cost of the projects reported in this bill (titles I and II) are based on current prices, which in general are those prevailing during the past year. They differ in general from the estimated amounts in the project documents depending upon the date of the document.

The committee did not consider it advisable to fix the actual cost of the work at these figures since at the time the work is undertaken there will undoubtedly be changes in price levels and possibly modifications in the plans as a result of more detailed engineering studies. The committee, however, does not consider that any untoward increases in estimated costs are automatically authorized and expects the Corps of Engineers to appear before it in explanation of any such increases prior to construction.

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The waterway transportation system of the United States is a Federal responsibility stemming from the beginning of the Nation. The work of improvement has been efficiently and competently executed by the Corps of Engineers. The size of the completed program which Congress has authorized over many years is indicated by the fact that there are now a total of 1,769 authorizations or modifications of previous authorizations for river and harbor improvements. The total cost of the completed navigation program is \$856 million. The total number of navigation projects or modifications now underway but not completed is 143 and the total cost is \$1,409 million, of which \$878 million has been appropriated through the fiscal year 1954. Navigation projects or modifications authorized but not yet started total 254 in number and have a total estimated cost of \$911 million of which \$5 million has been appropriated to date for planning purposes. The total active navigation program, therefore, amounts to 2,166 projects or modifications, having a total estimated cost of \$3,176 million, of which \$1,739 million is the cost to date. The foregoing figures exclude a few multiple-purpose projects which include other major functions in addition to navigation. Technically authorized but considered inactive or deferred for restudy are a number of navigation projects not included in the foregoing figure.

These projects lie in all parts of the United States and its possessions and include 28,000 miles of improved waterways, about 500 locks and dams, and almost 300 commercial harbors. Outstanding among them are the great coastal ports such as Boston, New York, Baltimore, Norfolk, Houston, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, the Great Lakes system and its many lake ports, and the inland and intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic and gulf coast and through the Mississippi-Ohio artery. The substantial and widespread benefits from the navigation program have demonstrated that the investment has been wisely made, both from the standpoint of economies and national welfare. The system has facilitated the growth of trade with other nations, developed commerce among the States, and contributed to the security and continued growth of the Nation. Commercial statistics for the latest calendar year (1952) show that the net waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890

million tons in that year, of which about 660 million were domestic and 230 million were foreign. This is 50 percent greater than the prewar peak of 1929. This committee pointed out in its report (Rept. No. 1143, 81st Cong.), in connection with the 1950 River and Harbor Act, that an alltime record total of 760 million tons had been reached in 1947. The figures given above show that that alltime total was exceeded by 11 percent in only 6 years.

With respect to the inland waterways system, a total of 168 billion ton-miles were carried in the calendar year 1952. Of this total, 104 billion were on the Great Lakes and 37 billion on the Mississippi-Ohio system. This represents an increase of 42 percent in the total ton-mileage since 1940, when the total commerce was 118 billion ton-miles.

Development of these waterways during the years of peace has resulted in the acquisition of a valuable asset in time of war. For example, the inland waterways during the last war were used to float almost 4,000 war vessels and several hundred items of auxiliary equipment from inland shipyards to the ocean. America's rivers and canals thus served a twofold purpose during the war. They shared importantly in the transportation of strategic materials and they made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes that otherwise would have been forced into congested coastal areas.

The committee during the testimony was impressed by the increasing use of larger and more economic vessels. These vessels, with deeper draft, greater lengths and beams have accelerated the need for progressive modification of the navigation program. The use of these larger and deeper draft carriers will result in eventual betterment of the economy and a lowering of prices to the consuming American public.

This the committee notes is one reason for the navigation survey program to be kept current in order that the improvements can be made sensitive to transportation trends. Since the survey program is the basic source of the entire navigation program, the committee feels that the backlog of preliminary examinations and surveys now assigned by the Congress to the Corps of Engineers should be more adequately financed. The future survey program should be reduced by a periodic pruning of authorized investigations so as to eliminate those which may no longer serve a useful or desired purpose.

The committee wishes to commend the Corps of Engineers for the work it has done in reviewing its outstanding investigations, with a view to classifying those obsolete as inactive.

PROJECTS IN TITLE I OF BILL AS PASSED BY HOUSE

SECTION 101

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Lubec Channel, Maine.....	S. 243, 81st Cong.....	\$74, 000
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.....	H. 556, 82d Cong.....	952, 000
Lynn Harbor, Mass.....	H. 568 81st Cong.....	65, 000
Weymouth Fore River, Mass.....	H. 555, 82d Cong.....	4, 400, 000
Town River, Quincy, Mass.....	H. 108, 83d Cong.....	525, 000
Scituate Harbor, Mass.....	H. 241, 83d Cong.....	375, 000
Fall River Harbor, Mass.....	H. 405, 83d Cong.....	694, 000
Bullocks Point Cove, R. I.....	H. 242, 83d Cong.....	166, 400
Sakonnet Harbor, R. I.....	H. 436, 82d Cong.....	555, 400
Patchogue River, Conn.....	H. 164, 83d Cong.....	135, 000
Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.....	H. 488, 81st Cong.....	112, 500
Westchester Creek, N. Y.....	H. 92, 82d Cong.....	32, 200
Hudson River, N. Y.....	H. 228, 83d Cong.....	31, 928, 000
Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.....	H. 89, 82d Cong.....	138, 000
Hackensack River, N. J.....	H. 252, 82d Cong.....	1, 973, 900
Misplillion River, Del.....	S. 229, 81st Cong.....	469, 400
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.....	S. 123, 83d Cong.....	101, 000, 000
Queenstown Harbor, Md.....	H. 718, 81st Cong.....	31, 900
Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Annes County, Md.....	H. 715, 81st Cong.....	23, 000
Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md.....	H. 90, 82d Cong.....	29, 000
Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md.....	H. 91, 82d Cong.....	192, 600
Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 619, 81st Cong.....	20, 300
Crisfield Harbor, Md.....	H. 435, 81st Cong.....	101, 750
Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 51, 82d Cong.....	45, 100
Pocomoke River, Md.....	H. 486, 81st Cong.....	678, 300
Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, Sinepuxent Bay, Md.....	H. 444, 82d Cong.....	704, 000
Parrotts Creek, Va.....	H. 46, 82d Cong.....	38, 700
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.....	S. 122, 83d Cong.....	6, 138, 700
Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va.....	H. 477, 81st Cong.....	95, 000
Oyster Channel, Va.....	S. 49, 83d Cong.....	75, 200
Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C.....	H. 453, 81st Cong.....	168, 000
Smiths Creek, N. C.....	H. 170, 83d Cong.....	102, 000
Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, N. C.....	H. 411, 83d Cong.....	175, 000
Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway.....	H. 379, 81st Cong.....	43, 200
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.....	H. 469, 81st Cong.....	765, 000
Savannah Harbor, Ga.....	H. 110, 83d Cong.....	414, 900
Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla.....	H. 446, 82d Cong.....	82, 200
Hillsboro River, Fla.....	H. 567, 81st Cong.....	16, 600
Apalachicola Bay, Fla.....	H. 156, 82d Cong.....	98, 000
Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island.....	H. 557, 82d Cong.....	635, 700
St. Joseph Bay, Fla.....	H. 595, 81st Cong.....	1, 312, 000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.....	H. 74, 83d Cong.....	5, 778, 000
Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.....	H. 394, 82d Cong.....	70, 000
Bayou Segnette Waterway, La.....	H. 413, 83d Cong.....	520, 000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.....	S. 80, 83d Cong.....	6, 875, 000
Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex.....	H. 478, 81st Cong.....	74, 300
Aransas Pass, Tex., in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.....	H. 376, 83d Cong.....	30, 700
Turtle Cove, Tex.....	H. 654, 81st Cong.....	40, 000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.....	H. 89, 83d Cong.....	829, 100
Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.....	H. 251, 82d Cong.....	82, 600
Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.....	H. 230, 83d Cong.....	65, 000
Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn.....	H. 347, 83d Cong.....	142, 000
Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.....	S. 81, 83d Cong.....	-----
Green and Barren, Ky.....	S. 82, 83d Cong.....	3, 434, 000
Knife River Harbor, Minn.....	H. 463, 83d Cong.....	219, 900
Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.....	H. 434, 83d Cong.....	220, 000
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.....	H. 554, 82d Cong.....	217, 200
Holland Harbor, Mich.....	H. 282, 83d Cong.....	574, 400
Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.....	H. 142, 82d Cong.....	225, 000
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.....	H. 620, 81st Cong.....	512, 000
Eric Harbor, Pa.....	H. 345, 83d Cong.....	174, 000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.....	H. 423, 83d Cong.....	270, 000
Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.....	H. 246, 83d Cong.....	36, 900
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.....	H. 487, 81st Cong.....	2, 459, 000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor, Calif.....	H. 161, 83d Cong.....	886, 500
Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.....	H. 389, 83d Cong.....	3, 869, 000
Port Hueneire, Calif.....	H. 362, 83d Cong.....	5, 437, 000
Rogue River, harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.....	S. 83, 83d Cong.....	3, 758, 700
Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oreg.....	S. 133, 81st Cong.....	41, 000
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.....	H. 249, 83d Cong.....	8, 555, 000
Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island.....	S. 8, 83d Cong.....	227, 100
Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.....	H. 425, 83d Cong.....	977, 000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.....	H. 412, 83d Cong.....	421, 800
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westbaven breakwater), Wash.....	H. —, 83d Cong.....	323, 700

¹ H indicates House document; S indicates Senate document³

SECTION 101—continued

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Anacortes Harbor, Wash.....	S. 102, 83d Cong.....	\$179,300
Neah Bay, Wash.....	H. 404, 83d Cong.....	139,250
Bellingham Harbor, Wash.....	H. 558, 82d Cong.....	1,366,650
Blaine Harbor, Wash.....	H. 240, 83d Cong.....	436,000
Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.....	H. 536, 81st Cong.....	3,397,300
Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.....	H. 155, 82d Cong.....	477,900
Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.....	H. 569, 81st Cong.....	395,500
Quillayute River, Wash.....	H. 579, 81st Cong.....	425,550
Seward Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 182, 83d Cong.....	81,200
Valdez Harbor, Alaska.....	do.....	116,600
Honolulu Harbor, T. H.....	H. 717, 81st Cong.....	3,022,000
Total.....		212,915,100

¹ H indicates House document; S indicates Senate document.

AMENDMENTS—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY SENATE COMMITTEE

ITEMS ADDED (SEC. 101)

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.....	H. 358, 83d Cong.....	\$91,389,000
Wilmington Harbor, N. C. (reimbursement).....		0
Charleston Harbor, S. C.....	S. 136, 83d Cong.....	200,000
Carabelle Harbor, Fla. (maintenance only).....	H. 451, 83d Cong.....	0
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.....		877,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.....		180,000
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.....		4,900,000
Richmond Harbor, Calif.....	H. 395, 83d Cong.....	2,086,000
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.....	S. 128, 83d Cong.....	1,500,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash.....		634,200
Sitka Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 414, 83d Cong.....	41,500
Dry Pass, Alaska.....	do.....	1,419,800
Neva Strait, Alaska.....	do.....	224,400
Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 465, 83d Cong.....	1,685,000
Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, T. H.....	H. 453, 83d Cong.....	1,166,400
Total.....		106,303,300

¹ H denotes House document; S denotes Senate document.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

SUMMARIES OF PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY SENATE COMMITTEE

DELAWARE RIVER, PA., N.J., AND DEL.

(H. Doc. 358, 83d Cong.)

The following description is from Senate Report No. 1817, on Senate bill 2317, reported by the Committee on Public Works on July 16, 1954:

The Delaware River rises in southeastern New York, flows southeasterly for 367 miles, and empties into Delaware Bay at Liston Point. The bay extends 47 miles to the ocean entrance between Cape May, N. J., and Cape Henlopen, Del. The river drains an area of 11,400 square miles, and in its lower reaches forms the boundary line between New Jersey on the east and Pennsylvania on the west. The stream is tidal below Trenton.

EXISTING PROJECT

The existing project for the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton provides for a channel 28 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia to the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge at Delair; thence a channel 25 feet deep and 300 feet wide to the upper end of the municipal marine terminal at Trenton; thence a channel 12 feet deep and 200 feet wide upstream to the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge at Trenton; with necessary widening at bends, turning basins, side channels, and anchorages. The total costs to June 30, 1952, were \$5,189,817 for new work and \$1,053,711 for maintenance. The estimate for annual cost of maintenance is \$232,000. The limited expenditures for maintenance in recent years has permitted some shoaling to occur.

The existing project from Philadelphia to the sea provides for a channel 37 feet deep from Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia to the Philadelphia Navy Yard, thence 40 feet deep to deep water in Delaware Bay, with widths of from 800 to 1,200 feet; construction and maintenance of additional dikes and training works; necessary anchorages; and maintenance of a channel enlargement opposite the Navy Yard. The total cost to June 30, 1952, was \$28,460,608 for new work and \$64,248,976 for maintenance. An expenditure of \$6,440,000 will be required to complete the project. The approved estimate for annual maintenance cost is \$6,165,000.

RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

The Chief of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in House Document No. 358, recommend that the existing project for the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton be modified to provide for enlarging the existing channel from Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia to the upstream end of Newbold Island, a distance of 23.5 miles, to a depth of 42 feet in rock and 40 feet in other material and a width of 400 feet in the straight reaches with suitable widening at bends, including relocation of the channel at the Pennsylvania Railroad bridge at Delair and suitable reconstruction of the bridge; for deepening the existing channel from the upstream end of Newbold Island to the Trenton marine terminal a distance of 5.5 miles, to 35 feet and widening the turning basin to 800 feet; for constructing such bank protection works as may be necessary; and for eliminating the authorized anchorage near the mouth of Biles Creek, Pa.

That the existing project for the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea be modified to provide for deepening the channel from the Philadelphia Navy Yard to Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia, a distance of 8.5 miles, to 42 feet in rock and 40 feet in other material, with a width of 500 feet through Horseshoe Bend and 400 feet through Philadelphia Harbor to Allegheny Avenue.

The modification is recommended provided that local interests agree to: (a) furnish, free of cost to the United States, all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas necessary for construction of the project and for subsequent maintenance when and as required; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the improvements; (c) that the United States Steel Co. agree to provide at its expense suitable terminal and transfer facilities at its Fairless plant, including a turning basin if and when required.

ESTIMATED COST

The estimated Federal cost of the recommended improvements between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., is \$86,899,000 for construction and \$759,600 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required.

The estimated Federal cost of the recommended improvements from Philadelphia to the sea is \$4,490,000 for construction, with no increase in the annual cost of maintenance.

HEARINGS

The committee held extensive hearings on S. 2317 on May 13, 1954. Members of Congress and representatives of cities and States, chambers of commerce, Delaware River Port Authority, civic organizations, waterways associations, and others, testified recommending authorization of this project.

It was stated that in 1951 traffic on the Delaware River was 73 million tons, of which 8 million was between Philadelphia and Trenton. This was an increase of about 40 percent in total commerce handled between 1946 and 1951. The estimated requirements at the new Fairless steel mill at Morrisville, Pa., will be about 13 million tons in 1960, as stated by a port official.

The committee was favorably impressed with the information presented on the development of the Delaware River port area that has taken place, the

terminal facilities available, and the need for additional improvements needed to safely care for the new 45,000-ton ore vessels being planned to bring iron ore from Venezuela to the Fairless plant. The defense aspects of the proposed improvement were considered to be of vital importance.

BENEFITS

The large amount of commerce on the Delaware River is essential to the widespread business and industrial activities in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Camden, and Trenton. An area within 100-mile radius of these port facilities, includes the cities of New York and Baltimore, with a population of 21 million. The local area is almost entirely industrial, containing numerous manufacturing and processing plants of national importance in the character and volume of their products, as well as many smaller industries. It is well served by several important railroad systems and a network of State and national highways. There are about 300 wharves and piers in the harbor area, most of which are open to the public and equipped to handle general cargo. Commerce consists of sand and gravel, bituminous and lignite coal, crude petroleum and petroleum products, iron ore, sugar, grain, and many varied products from all over the world.

Enlargement of the project is now essential to accommodate traffic that has developed, and to relieve congestion in the harbor and enable full use of the terminals. Extension to Trenton is necessary due to the recent construction of a large modern steel plant by the United States Steel Co. below Morrisville, Pa. This plant will receive high iron content ores from Venezuela and other foreign sources directly by water and is vital to national defense and national welfare. The estimated average annual benefits, based on the savings in transportation cost on coal and iron ore principally, are \$8,450,000. The benefit cost ratio is 1.93. These benefits do not include prospective commerce from additional industries that are expected to locate in the area, or others that might use the facility.

DISCUSSION

The committee believes that an increased navigable depth between Philadelphia and Trenton is necessary for the continued and unimpeded development of the industrial area in the Delaware River Basin, with large regional and national benefits. The industrial area is expanding and important defense industries requiring improved navigation facilities are now located in the area. New industries along the channel below Newbold Island will doubtless be established to make further use of the deeper channel.

The committee considered the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers that local interests contribute one-half the additional cost for construction of the 40-foot channel over a 35-foot channel. It believes that adoption of this recommendation would be inconsistent with the national policy followed for many years on navigation projects over the entire country.

The committee concluded that the 40-foot project should be authorized and constructed in a single operation to effect greater transportation and construction economies. It believes the project to be amply justified, and that the benefits from the deeper project will be widespread, as are other deep-draft navigation projects required for movement of vessels having drafts in excess of 35 feet, and that the Delaware River project should be treated the same as other projects.

WILMINGTON HARBOR, N. C.

Modification of the existing project for Wilmington Harbor, N. C., was authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950. The authorized project provides for a channel 35 feet deep and 400 feet wide through the ocean bar from the Atlantic Ocean into Cape Fear River, and 34 feet deep and 400 feet wide up Cape Fear River to the upper end of the anchorage basin at Wilmington, including the anchorage basin and increased width at the bends. The total estimated cost is \$2,093,700. No funds have been appropriated for this work.

During the fall of 1951, the North Carolina Ports Authority dredged an area in the transition channel and within the wider channel limits of the Federal project, to a depth of 32 feet, to facilitate operation of

the port and turning basin and increase the value of Wilmington Harbor to general commerce. The cost of the work was \$65,000.

The work performed is a part of the Federal project and would have to be done as a part of that project when its construction is undertaken. The work was accomplished subsequent to the Federal authorization, and reimbursement to the State can be made when appropriations for the project become available, subject to a finding by the Chief of Engineers that the work has been done in accordance with the authorized project.

CHARLESTON HARBOR, CHARLESTON, S. C.

(S. Doc. 136, 83d Cong.)

Location: Charleston Harbor includes the lower portion of the tidal estuaries of the Cooper and Ashley Rivers, which unite and flow into the Atlantic about midway of the coast of South Carolina. Mean tide range is 5.2 feet.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, May 12, 1950.

Existing project: Federal navigation project provides for channel 35 feet by 1,000 feet from sea to the inner end of jetties, then 600 feet wide to Town Creek, then 500 feet wide through Town Creek, then 600 feet wide to navy yard, then 400 feet wide to Goose Creek with turning basin, 700 feet at port terminals, together with a 30-foot by 600-foot channel in Cooper River around the east and north side of Drum Island; an anchorage area, 30 feet deep between Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie; and shallow draft improvement in Shem Creek.

Recommended plan of improvement: Modification of existing project to provide for a channel 35 feet deep in Cooper River east and north of Drum Island.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Survey report.....	\$200,000		\$200,000

Local cooperation: Local interests will provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and maintenance and hold and save the United States free from damage.

Project economics:

Annual charges:

Interest and amortization.....	\$7,100
Increased maintenance.....	114,000

Total.....	121,100
------------	---------

Annual benefits: Unevaluated. Includes elimination of hazard, greater maneuverability, relief of traffic congestion, savings in time for vessels using Town Creek wharves, and more practical from a Navy standpoint.

Benefit-cost ratio: Not evaluated.

Remarks: The new east passage around Drum Island will reduce the collision hazard, particularly for large tankers.

CARRABELLE HARBOR, FLA.

(H. Doc. 451, 83d Cong.)

Location: Carrabelle Harbor, Fla., is on the east bank of Carrabelle River about 1.5 miles from its mouth. The river, a small tidal stream about 400 to 700 feet wide and up to 28 feet deep, enters St. George Sound on the gulf coast 22 miles east of the Apalachicola River. Upstream from the harbor, broad mud flats extend from the harbor bank to midstream. The mean range of tide is 1.9 feet.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, May 17, 1950.

Existing project: The existing Federal project provides for an entrance channel 27 feet deep and 200 feet wide from the Gulf of Mexico through East Pass to a point west of Dog Island, thence 25 feet deep and 150 feet wide through St. George Sound and Carrabelle River to a turning basin 500 feet square and 25 feet deep at the town of Carrabelle, a total distance of about 8 miles. The present controlling depth is about 16 feet.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for maintenance of a channel dredged with emergency funds in 1951 at a cost of \$3,800. The channel, 8 feet deep and 60 feet wide, extends along the waterfront of Carrabelle, Fla., 1,200 feet from the head of the existing project turning basin.

Estimated cost: No additional first cost because dredging has been accomplished.

Local cooperation: Local interests will provide suitable spoil disposal areas and hold and save the United States free from damage.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$1,630	\$1,630
Annual benefits.....	\$2,810	\$2,810
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.72	1.72

Remarks: The project is economically justified on benefits from reduced delays and damages to vessels, and from elimination of the rehandling of seafood.

PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MISS.

Location: Pascagoula Harbor is located along the lower 6.8 miles of Pascagoula River and the lower 4 miles of Dog River. It is in southeastern Mississippi, about 61 miles by water west of Mobile Harbor, Ala., and about 44 miles east of Gulfport Harbor, Miss.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted August 16, 1950.

Existing project: Provides for a through channel of the maximum dimensions that can be secured by the expenditure of \$283,000, but not exceeding 25 feet deep and 300 feet wide across the outer bar at Horn Island Pass, thence 22 feet deep and 225 feet wide to the railroad bridge at Pascagoula, thence 22 feet deep and 150 feet wide, to a point on Dog River 4 miles above its mouth. The River and Harbor Act of 1950 modified the project to provide for a cutoff channel in Dog River. The total length of the existing project is 21.7 miles.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel from the Gulf of Mexico to the L. & N. Railroad bridge in Pascagoula, having a depth of 30 feet and a width of 250 feet, with 35-foot depth over the bar.

Estimated cost:

From Gulf of Mexico to beacon A.....	\$392, 000
From beacon A to railroad bridge.....	485, 000
Total.....	877, 000

Remarks: Local interests have indicated that an oil company is planning to build a refinery at Pascagoula and there is a possibility that an aluminum company may build a plant in the area to take ore shipped from British Guiana.

This project represents an emergency need for channel improvement of an existing channel to meet the contemplated shipping needs from the planned installation of a refinery at Bayou Cassotte. The committee was told that as a part of the development plans the local authorities are going to spend \$2 million for a channel leading from Bayou Cassotte to the public channel.

PORT ARANSAS-CORPUS CHRISTI WATERWAY

(Report of Chief of Engineers, May 24, 1954)

Location: In southern portion of coast of Texas, 180 miles southwest of Galveston and 132 miles north of the mouth of the Rio Grande.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted September 27, 1951.

Existing project: Provides jettied entrance from Gulf of Mexico, channels for deepwater navigation 38 and 36 feet deep. Affords deep-water navigation to Harbor Island and Corpus Christi with turning basins at Corpus Christi, Avery Point, and an inner basin at Harbor Island.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project to provide for an entrance channel 36 feet deep and 400 feet wide on a tangent alinement from the 400-foot channel in Corpus Christi Bay near the Corpus Christi breakwater, to the flared approach channel to the Corpus Christi turning basin.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (December 1953).....	\$180, 000	\$506, 000	\$686, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, rights-of-way, spoil-disposal areas; accomplish relocation and alteration of pipeline and cable crossings on rights-of-way and removal of buildings, structures, and a portion of rubble-mound breakwater, hold and save the United States from damage.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	Current
Interest and amortization.....	\$26, 700
Maintenance.....	\$5, 300
Total.....	\$32, 000
Annual benefits:	
Savings on transportation.....	\$37, 400
Reduction in hazards to navigation.....	\$35, 000
Total.....	\$72, 400
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2. 2

Remarks: The proposed modification of the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway will afford material benefits to established and prospective commerce by a reduction in hazards to navigation and a saving in transportation costs.

ASHTABULA HARBOR, OHIO

(Report of Chief of Engineers, June 29, 1954)

Location: On southerly shore of Lake Erie at mouth of Ashtabula River, 59 miles east of Cleveland.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 24, 1953.

Existing project: Provides in general for an outer harbor protected by two breakwaters; an entrance channel 28 feet deep between existing breakwaters 600 feet wide, a channel 25 feet deep and 1,100 feet maximum width through outer harbor to inner east breakwater; a channel 24 feet deep to mouth of Ashtabula River, channel 24 feet deep to a point 2,000 feet upstream, channel generally 18 feet deep and to the upper car-ferry slip, channel generally 16 feet deep to the southerly end of the turning basin, a channel 16 feet deep to a point 1,550 feet upstream of the turning basin, also an approach channel 24 feet deep, with a minimum width of 250 feet from the 24-foot section of the outer harbor eastward to the New York Central Railroad Co.'s slip.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for modification of the existing project for the outer harbor to provide for a 700-foot-wide access channel terminating in a basin having a width of 1,200 feet and about 1,500 feet long to a depth of 25 feet in earth and 26 feet in rock; elimination of portion of existing 21-foot depth area north of recommended approach channel.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$4, 900, 000		\$4, 900, 000

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; construct and maintain dock facilities open to all on equal terms; and dredge the slips and access thereto from the basin to depths for full utilization of the Federal project.

Project economics:

	<i>Project document</i>
Annual charges.....	\$186, 000
Annual benefits, transportation savings.....	562, 900
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3. 0

Remarks: Existing depths inadequate in approach to new dock facilities. Improvement will produce substantial savings to existing and prospective commerce, which has averaged about 14 million tons per year from 1944 to 1953. Principal items of present commerce are iron ore and coal; additional chemical movements are expected. Local interests are providing access roads, dockfill, and dredging, estimated to cost \$3,710,000.

RICHMOND HARBOR, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 395, 83d Cong.)

Location: Richmond Harbor is on east side of San Francisco Bay. It extends principally from Point San Pablo southeast about 4.5 miles to Point Richmond.

Report authorized by: House Public Works Committee resolution, April 13, 1948.

Existing project: A channel 20 feet deep and 2,000 feet long on north side of Point San Pablo; approach areas 4,000 and 2,500 feet long and 32 feet deep between deep water in the bay and berthing areas provided by local interests; an inner harbor channel of various widths and 30 feet deep from deep water in the outer harbor to shore end of Santa Fe Channel together with turning basins; and a training wall on bay side of the channel between Points Richmond and Potrero. Project completed except for a strip along west side of channel just north of Point Potrero.

Plan of recommended improvement: A channel 35 feet deep and 600 feet wide adjacent to Southampton Shoal from deep water to the outer harbor, enlarging the approach area in vicinity of Richmond long wharf for 3,670 feet and deepening enlarged area to 35 feet, deepening to 35 feet and widening to 600 feet the inner harbor entrance channel from deep water to the turning basin at Point Richmond, deepening to 35 feet the turning basin at Point Richmond and thence the inner harbor project to a point in Santa Fe Channel 2,000 feet above its entrance, including dredging on the east side of the channel in vicinity of Point Potrero, and maintenance of a suitable approach area at the naval fuel annex wharf to a depth of 35 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
OCE report (January 1952).....	\$1, 866, 000	-----	\$1, 866, 000
Current (October 1953).....	2, 086, 000	-----	2, 086, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish necessary easements, hold and save United States free from damages, construct and maintain suitable wharves and shiploading and cargo-storage facilities.

14 AUTHORIZE CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$68,300	\$76,500
Maintenance (in addition to existing project).....	41,400	41,400
Total.....	109,700	117,900
Annual benefits.....	191,800	214,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.7	1.8

Remarks: Maintenance of the approach area at the naval fuel annex wharf should be with military funds.

TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OREG.

(S. Doc. 128, 83d Cong.)

Location: On Pacific coast of Oregon 47 miles south of Columbia River. Bay separated from ocean by Bayocean Peninsula.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, June 20, 1952.

Existing project: Provides for 5,700-foot jetty on north side of entrance; 18-foot bar channel of practicable width; 18 by 200-foot channel from bay to Miami Cove; initial dredging of 12-foot basin and approach channel at Garibaldi; 16 by 200-foot channel to 500-foot wide basin at Hobsonville; and regulating works as required.

Plan of recommended improvement: Close breach in Bayocean Peninsula by constructing sand dike 1.4 miles long on alinement extending between Pitcher Point and town of Bayocean.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (December 1953).....	\$1,500,000	\$275,000	\$1,775,000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages including damages to oysterbeds and other shellfish grounds; contribute in cash 15 percent, but not to exceed \$250,000, of the cost of construction.

Project economics:

	Report (December 1953)
Annual charges:	
Interest and amortization.....	\$62,600
Maintenance.....	25,000
Total.....	87,600
Annual benefits:	
Benefit on Federal channel.....	116,500
Saving on bay channel maintenance.....	67,500
Prevention of damage to oyster beds.....	22,450
Total.....	206,450
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.36

Remarks: The committee notes that the closure of the breach in Bayocean Peninsula is warranted by prospective benefits to navigation and from protection of valuable oyster beds and other economic assets of the bay area. The adoption of this project is recommended.

TACOMA HARBOR WASH. (PORT INDUSTRIAL WATERWAY)

(Report of the division engineer, April 26, 1954)

Location: Tacoma Harbor is in northwestern Washington at the head of Commencement Bay, an arm of Puget Sound, 26 nautical miles south of Seattle.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Committee, House of Representatives, resolution July 18, 1945.

Existing project: Provides for waterways and channels of varied depths and widths, including dredging to a depth of 30 feet of an area in the Wapato Waterway (renamed Port Industrial Waterway) not nearer than 50 feet from established pierhead lines or lateral limits of the waterway nor 100 feet from the northerly line of East 11th Street. Existing project is about 74 percent complete; dredging of Port Industrial Waterway to a depth of 30 feet would complete the existing project.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of the existing project to provide for dredging to a depth of 30 feet below mean lower low water the main channel in Port Industrial (Wapato) Waterway extending from deep water in Commencement Bay to not nearer than 100 feet from the northwest line of Lincoln Avenue, and over widths not nearer than 50 feet from established pierhead lines or lateral limits of the waterway, except through East 11th Street bridge where a channel width of 150 feet shall be provided.

Estimated cost: ¹

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
March 1954 prices.....	\$634,200	² \$203,030	\$837,230

¹ Includes cost of the authorized project not completed and the recommended extension.

² Includes cash contribution or equivalent work of \$26,330.

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, disposal areas, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free from damages; accomplish alterations to utilities; provide and maintain suitable terminal and transfer facilities; bear the additional cost of disposing dredged material from the Federal project as fill on land, such additional cost amounting to about 4 percent of the total dredging cost, or \$26,330 at present prices.

Project economics:

Annual charges:

Federal:

Interest and amortization.....	\$22, 360
Maintenance.....	14, 000

Non-Federal.....	12, 160
------------------	---------

Total.....	48, 520
------------	---------

Annual benefits:

Transportation savings.....	64, 500
-----------------------------	---------

Ship repair and construction savings.....	20, 000
---	---------

Land enhancement.....	26, 400
-----------------------	---------

Total.....	110, 900
------------	----------

Benefit-cost ratio.....	2. 29
-------------------------	-------

Remarks: The extension is needed to provide for expansion of port facilities.

HARBORS AND RIVERS IN ALASKA

(H. Doc. 414, 83d Cong.)

Location: Area concerned is in the western portion of southeastern Alaska. This section is known as the Panhandle or Inside Passage area.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution, October 30, 1945; River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945; and Flood Control Act, June 30, 1948.

Existing project: Sitka: Provides for an entrance channel 22 feet deep and 150 feet wide, and a small-boat harbor of about 13 acres and 10 feet deep in Crescent Bay. Small-boat harbor has not been started. Dry Pass: Provides for a channel 60 feet wide and 6 feet deep between El Capitan Passage and Shaken Strait. Completed in 1937. Neva Strait: No Federal project.

Plan of recommended improvement: Sitka: Modification of existing project to provide for dredging the United States Forest Service basin 10 feet deep, 130 feet wide, and 270 feet long, and its approach 10 feet deep. Dry Pass: Modification of existing project to provide for a channel 12 feet deep and 70 feet wide. Neva Strait: Provide a channel 24 feet deep and 200 feet wide through Whitestone Narrows.

Estimated cost (all Federal):

	OCE report (1949)	Current (Sep- tember 1953)
Sitka.....	\$32, 500	\$41, 500
Dry Pass.....	1, 113, 600	1, 419, 800
Neva Strait.....	176, 000	224, 400

Local cooperation: Sitka: Hold and save United States free from damages. Dry Pass and Neva Strait: None required.

Project economics:

	Sitka		Dry Pass		Neva Strait	
	Report	Current	Report	Current	Report	Current
Annual charges:						
Interest and amortization	\$1,790	\$2,070	\$52,120	\$61,700	\$7,200	\$8,320
Maintenance	1,100	1,410	1,850	2,360	2,000	2,550
Total	2,890	3,480	53,970	64,060	9,200	10,870
Annual benefits:						
Prevention of damage or loss	3,000	3,800	17,700	22,550		
Transportation savings			44,920	57,270	10,000	12,800
Increased fish catch					7,100	10,170
Total	3,000	3,800	62,620	79,820	17,100	22,970
Benefit-cost ratio	1.04	1.09	1.16	1.25	1.86	2.11

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection to the submission of the report to Congress.

Remarks: The committee notes that the general benefits from the proposed improvement are sufficient to warrant their provision at Federal expense, and accordingly has included an item in the bill authorizing construction.

KODIAK HARBOR, ALASKA

(H. Doc. 465, 83d Cong.)

(Report of Chief of Engineers, April 16, 1954)

Location: Kodiak Harbor is on the northeastern coast of Kodiak Island in the Gulf of Alaska at the town of Kodiak.

Report authorized by: River and Harbor Act, March 2, 1945 and Flood Control Act, June 30, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for a channel 22 feet deep and 200 feet wide in North Channel. Partial construction was accomplished under a United States Navy contract in 1942.

Plan of recommended improvement: Modification of existing project to provide a small-boat basin of about 12 acres in area dredged to depths of 12 and 8 feet and protected by 2 rock breakwaters about 1,250 and 780 feet long.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
September 1953 prices	\$1,685,000	\$198,600	\$1,883,600

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including quarry rights; perform maintenance dredging; construct, maintain, and operate mooring facilities and public landing; and hold and save United States free from damages.

Project economics:

Annual charges:

Federal:

Interests and amortization.....	\$59, 600
Maintenance.....	2, 000

Non-Federal.....	17, 700
------------------	---------

Total.....	79, 300
------------	---------

Annual benefits:

Storm damage prevented.....	23, 000
-----------------------------	---------

Savings in mooring and protecting boats.....	52, 000
--	---------

Increased net value of fish.....	33, 350
----------------------------------	---------

Total.....	108, 350
------------	----------

Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 37
-------------------------	-------

Remarks: The project is needed to protect fishing craft and other vessels from damage, and it will also result in an increased value of the fish catch.

NAWILIWILI AND PORT ALLEN HARBORS, KAUAI, T. H.

(H. Doc. 453, 83d Cong.)

Location: Nawiliwili Harbor and Port Allen Harbor are about 21 miles apart and are on the southeasterly coast and south coast, respectively, of the Island of Kauai, T. H.

Report authorized by: House Committee on Public Works, June 17, 1948.

Existing project: Nawiliwili—Rubble-mound breakwater 2,150 feet long; entrance channel 35 feet deep, 600 feet wide, and about 2,400 feet long; and an inner basin 35 feet deep, 1,100 feet wide, and about 2,000 feet long. Completed in 1930. Costs to June 30, 1951, \$1,197,178 for new work and \$302,138 for maintenance. Port Allen—entrance channel 35 feet deep and 500 feet wide; basin 35 feet deep, 1,200 feet wide, and 1,500 feet long; and a breakwater 1,200 feet long. Completed in 1948. Costs to June 30, 1951, \$752,645 for new work and \$72,848 for maintenance.

Plan of recommended improvement: No improvement of Port Allen Harbor needed at this time. Nawiliwili—Deepen channel to 40 feet over existing project width and enlarge basin to include an additional area, 440 feet wide with an average length of 1,230 feet, deepened to 35 feet.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
OCE report (November 1952).....	\$1,121, 600	¹ \$38, 500	\$1, 160, 100
Current (October 1953).....	1, 166, 400	¹ 39, 500	1, 205, 900

¹ Cash contribution.

Local cooperation: Provide easements and rights-of-way, hold and save United States free from damage, contribute in cash cost of revetment of the fill area, \$39,500, and maintain and operate terminal and transfer facilities and the improved harbor.

Project economics:

	OCE report	Current
Annual charges.....	\$47,000	\$48,600
Annual benefits:		
Direct benefits.....	58,030	60,400
Increased land value.....	2,700	2,700
Total.....	60,730	63,100
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.29	1.3

Remarks: The committee notes that the project has a favorable benefit-cost ratio and accordingly recommends its authorization.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

PROJECTS IN BILL AS PASSED BY HOUSE

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Hampton Beach, N. H.....	H. 325, 83d Cong.....	\$140,000
Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.....	H. 134, 82d Cong.....	189,000
Revere Beach, Mass.....	H. 146, 82d Cong.....	402,900
Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.....	H. 145, 82d Cong.....	409,000
South Shore, State of Rhode Island.....	H. 490, 81st Cong.....	166,550
Hammonasset River to East River (area 2), Conn.....	H. 474, 81st Cong.....	
Hammonasset Beach.....		166,600
Middle Beach.....		20,400
New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (area 3), Conn.....	H. 203, 83d Cong.....	
Prospect Beach.....		84,600
Woodmont Shore.....		42,400
Gulf Beach.....		13,100
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.....		18,300
Housatonic River to Ash Creek (area 7), Conn.....	H. 248, 83d Cong.....	
Short Beach.....		26,500
Seaside Park.....		119,000
Atlantic City, N. J.....	H. 538, 81st Cong.....	2,044,000
Ocean City, N. J.....	H. 184, 83d Cong.....	105,000
Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.....	H. 206, 83d Cong.....	260,000
Virginia Beach, Va.....	H. 186, 83d Cong.....	525,514
Pinellas County, Fla.....	H. 380, 83d Cong.....	34,300
Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan.....	H. 28, 83d Cong.....	1,176,400
Vermillion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio.....	H. 229, 83d Cong.....	185,000
Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio.....	H. 502, 81st Cong.....	
Edgewater Park.....		1,275,000
White City Park.....		68,900
Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.....	H. 231, 83d Cong.....	2,006,000
Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.....	H. 343, 83d Cong.....	136,500
Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.....	H. 277, 83d Cong.....	3,874,000
Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.....	H. 349, 83d Cong.....	
Seal Beach.....		65,700
Surfside.....		91,600
Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.....	H. 29, 83d Cong.....	73,700
Waikiki Beach, T. H.....	H. 227, 83d Cong.....	283,700
Total.....		14,003,664

¹ H. indicates House document.

There were no additional projects for beach erosion control proposed for consideration by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY ITEMS ADDED

SECTION 103

Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland, Maine.

Southwest Harbor, Maine.

Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine.

Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Fla., to determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective measures with respect thereto.

Chipola River, Fla., for measures to maintain satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM THE CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER

SECTION 105

The original route contemplated was recommended when the proposed right-of-way was mostly wild land. Conditions have greatly changed and if this route were to be used now it would result in cutting off the town of Venice from the gulf and its beaches. Thirty-one homes and five apartment houses are in the first route.

Alternate route C-1 meets with the approval of the Corps of Engineers and the local authorities. Some question has arisen as to the language of the report on the 1950 River and Harbor Act as it applies to this project. The wording of this report was not intended to apply to "any other route as may be deemed feasible by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary of the Army" and hence the 1948 proviso does not apply to alternate route C-1. This approval of alternate route C-1 will enable the local authorities to proceed with the acquisition of right-of-way without waiting for full details of local contributions to be worked out, and before land values become prohibitive.

PEARL RIVER, MISS.

SECTION 106

The River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, authorized improvement of Pearl River, providing for a channel from the mouth of West Pearl River for 58 miles to the mouth of Bogalusa Creek at Bogalusa, La., by channel work, canals, and three locks. The project is essentially complete at a cost of about \$8 million.

One of the requirements of local cooperation recommended in the project document House Document 408, 75th Congress, was that local interests provide ferries and bridges necessary for land traffic across the lateral and terminal canals. At that time the area between the canal and river was predominantly swampland with a few scattered tracts of cultivated land and about 11 homesites. Three or more ferries were to be provided for convenience of egress and ingress of the people living in this area.

There is at present only one family in the area, and because of the nature of the land, no other residents are expected to occupy any part of the area in the foreseeable future. Local interests have communicated with the family and an attempt is being made to arrive at a solution which will eliminate the necessity for the ferry service.

The committee believes that local interests should provide assurances that they will hold and save the United States free from any claim for damage which might result from deprivation of access to the area.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

Title II covers the flood-control projects, project modifications, basin authorization increases, and certain miscellaneous matters which have been considered and reported favorably. They represent an orderly continuation of the flood-control program throughout the United States and its possessions, which has evolved from the 1936 Flood Control Act and subsequent acts. Included also are project modifications in connection with the great project for the lower Mississippi Valley.

The Congress and the public are now well aware of the importance of flood control and related water-resources development in the growth of this Nation. Public consciousness has been increasingly educated to the need for the control of destructive floodwaters and the harnessing of their energy for beneficial use. Each passing year brings this problem more vividly to the American people. Since passage of the 1950 Flood Control Act, there have been terrible lessons taught in this field, the most notable being that of the disastrous Kansas River flood of 1951 which wrecked the fertile valley, wiped out a part of Kansas City, and caused loss and hardship for many miles downstream. This flood caused a damage of about \$1 billion, which is many times more than the entire cost of the projects in this bill for the Kansas River Basin and approaches the total estimated cost for the overall flood-control plan for the Missouri River Basin.

Interest in a Federal flood-control program began during the middle of the last century and culminated in the formation of the Mississippi River Commission by Congress in 1879 and of the California Debris Commission in 1893. As the result of the studies made by these bodies, projects were established by law on the Sacramento River in 1917 and in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River in 1928. It was recognized that the control of a major stream system like the lower Mississippi was far beyond the ability of local communities or even States.

Flood control as a national policy was firmly established by the National Flood Control Act of 1936 which stated as a declaration of policy that floods constituted a menace to national welfare and that it is the sense of Congress that flood control is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States and local interests, where the benefits are in excess of the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected. From that beginning there has grown the important flood-control program undertaken by the United States.

The flood-control program includes 287 authorizations on which work has been fully completed at a total cost of \$545 million. At the present time there are 100 projects underway at a total estimated cost of \$1,652 million, of which \$880 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. This does not include the project for the lower Mississippi River, which has a total estimated cost of \$1,293 million, of which \$849 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. In the category of flood-control projects not yet started there is a total of 196 with an estimated cost of \$1,371 million, of which \$12 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954 for planning purposes. The total number of projects or project modifications in the active flood-control program, including the Mississippi River as

1 project, is therefore, 584, at a total estimated cost of \$4,861 million, of which \$2,286 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1954. In addition there are a number of projects in the authorized backlog which are considered inactive or deferred for restudy. The foregoing figures with respect to numbers of projects and estimated costs do not include a number of multiple-purpose projects which include other major functions as well as flood control.

The flood-control program undertaken by the Federal Government has already brought large returns. It is estimated that if no Federal flood-control measures had been undertaken the total average flood damages in the United States would be in excess of \$800 million a year. The Federal flood-control works now in operation prevent flood losses estimated at more than \$300 million a year, and a considerable amount of flood damage is prevented by works constructed by local interests. The remaining average annual flood damage actually experienced in this country totals, therefore, about \$500 million a year under the present state of development.

PROJECTS IN TITLE II OF BILL AS PASSED BY HOUSE

SECTION 203

Project	Document No. ¹	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Connecticut River Basin:			
Modification of project to provide for Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H.			
Modification of plan for West River Basin, Vt.			
Susquehanna River, vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.	H. 500, 81st Cong.	\$4,469,000	
Central and Southern Florida (modification of project).	H. 643, 80th Cong.		\$7,000,000
Lower Mississippi River:			
Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and lock for navigation.	(2)	32,000,000	
Channel in Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, La.	S. 53, 82d Cong.	440,000	
Modification of project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area.	H. 85, 83d Cong.		
Modification of project for New Madrid floodway.	H. 183, 83d Cong.	1,743,000	
Buffalo Bayou Basin, flood protection at Houston, Tex.	H. 250, 83d Cong.	16,191,600	
Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex.	H. 535, 81st Cong.	40,000,000	
Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex.	H. 344, 83d Cong.	30,254,000	
Guadalupe River, Tex. (modification of project for Canyon Dam).			
Rio Grande Basin:			
At Albuquerque, N. Mex.	H. 464, 83d Cong.	7,500,000	
At Roswell, N. Mex., on Rio Hondo River.	H. 436, 83d Cong.	5,658,000	
White River Basin: Modification of plan for Greers Ferry Reservoir, Ark., and authorization of Beaver Reservoir, Ark.	(3)		
Arkansas River and tributaries, at Enid, Okla.	H. 185, 83d Cong.	965,000	
Upper Mississippi River:			
Urban areas at Alton, Ill.	H. 397, 83d Cong.	2,500,000	
Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill.	H. 281, 83d Cong.	30,551,000	
Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, No. 8, Monroe County, Ill.	H. 396, 83d Cong.	480,000	
Sny Island levee, Levee Drainage District, Ill.	H. 247, 83d Cong.	7,046,300	
Upper Iowa River, Iowa.	H. Doc. 375, 83d Cong.	979,600	
Missouri River Basin authorization.			144,000,000
Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas.	H. 642, 81st Cong.	73,710,000	
Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, modification of project.			
Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo., modification of project.	H. 549, 81st Cong.		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 23.

SECTION 203—continued

Project	Document No. ¹	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Missouri River Basin authorization—Continued			
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.....	H. 561, 81st Cong.....	\$19,612,000	-----
Little Sioux River, Iowa.....	S. 127, 83d Cong.....	10,076,000	-----
Little Missouri River and tributaries at Mar- marth, N. Dak.....	S. 134, 81st Cong.....	212,300	-----
Coal Creek and tributaries, Tenn.....	H. 154, 82d Cong.....	745,200	-----
Ohio River Basin: Sandy Lick Creek, vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pa.....	H. 716, 81st Cong.....	570,000	-----
Paint Rock River, Ala.....	H. —, 83d Cong.....	1,001,300	-----
Kalamazoo River, Mich.....	S. 98, 83d Cong.....	4,201,550	-----
Little Calumet River, Ind.....	H. 153, 82d Cong.....	509,900	-----
Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek, Calif.....	-----	-----	\$12,500,000
Sacramento River Basin:			
Middle Creek, Calif.....	H. 367, 81st Cong.....	1,110,000	-----
American River, Calif.....	H. 367, 81st Cong.....	1,600,000	-----
Lower San Joaquin River Basin.....			
Columbia River Basin: Modification of project to include power development at Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oreg., and Green Peter Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg., including White Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg.	H. 531, 81st Cong.....	-----	5,000,000 180,000,000
Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska.....	H. 54, 82d Cong.....	380,000	-----
Wailoa Stream and its tributaries, island of Hawaii, T. H.....	H. 529, 81st Cong.....	347,000	-----
Department of Agriculture, sec. 205, prosecution of works heretofore authorized.....	-----	-----	20,000,000
Total.....	-----	294,852,750	368,500,000

¹ H indicates House Document; S indicates Senate document.

² Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Apr. 8, 1954.

³ Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Feb. 19, 1954.

AMENDMENTS—PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY SENATE COMMITTEE

ITEMS ADDED (SEC. 203)

Projects	Document No. ¹	Estimated Federal cost
West Branch of Susquehanna River, Pa.....	-----	\$25,000,000
Reelfoot Lake area, Kentucky and Tennessee.....	-----	748,100
Belton Reservoir, Tex. (reservation of water supply for Fort Hood).....	-----	0
Pecos River, N. Mex. and Tex.....	-----	9,540,000
Conway County Drainage and Levee District, Arkansas.....	H. 167, 82d Cong.....	230,600
Holla Bend Bottom, Ark.....	H. 157, 82d Cong.....	312,000
Bear Creek, Mo.....	H. 435, 83d Cong.....	3,326,000
Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota.....	-----	3,430,000
Cold Brook Dam, S. Dak.....	-----	15,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak., facilities at Pollock, S. Dak.....	-----	200,000
Heart River at Mandan, S. Dak.....	-----	1,727,000
Santa Maria River and tributaries, California.....	H. 400, 83d Cong.....	10,182,000
San Lorenzo River, Calif.....	H. 447, 83d Cong.....	2,665,000
San Lorenzo Creek, Calif.....	H. 452, 83d Cong.....	3,790,000
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada.....	-----	791,000
Amazon Creek, Oreg.....	S. 131, 83d Cong.....	893,600
Total.....	-----	62,850,300

¹ H indicates House document; S indicates Senate document.

FLOOD CONTROL

SUMMARIES OF PROJECTS RECOMMENDED BY SENATE
COMMITTEE

WEST BRANCH, SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA., AND N. Y.

(Report of Chief of Engineers, June 25, 1954)

Location: West Branch of Susquehanna River rises in Cambria County, Pa., and flows 240 miles generally east in the north central portion of the State to its junction with the North Branch at Sunbury. Drainage area is 6,990 square miles, and had a population of 381,000 in 1950.

Report authorized by: House Flood Control Committee resolution, May 29, 1946.

Existing Federal project: Authorized local-protection project for Williamsport, providing 3 feet of freeboard above 1936 flood levels, is substantially complete. Project authorizations for Milton, Montgomery, Muncy, Jersey Shore, and Lock Haven, have expired due to lack of assurances of local cooperation.

Non-Federal projects: Pennsylvania has constructed a small reservoir for flood control and recreation on Little Pine Creek. It is now constructing First Fork Dam, estimated to cost \$17,770,000, included in the original plan of the Corps of Engineers. State has also constructed some 60 small projects, mostly for clearing and snagging, in recent years.

Plan of recommended improvement: Flood-control reservoirs on West Branch at the Curwensville site on Kettle Creek above the mouth, and on Bald Eagle Creek at the Blanchard site.

Estimated cost (all Federal) (February 1954 prices):

(a) Curwensville Reservoir.....	\$24, 230, 000
(b) Kettle Creek Reservoir.....	15, 400, 000
(c) Blanchard Reservoir.....	22, 890, 000
Total.....	62, 520, 000

Local cooperation: Pennsylvania to furnish assurances satisfactory to Secretary of the Army that it will coordinate operation of First Fork Reservoir with the three recommended reservoirs, when constructed, to receive optimum system flood-control benefits.

Project economics:

	Report (4 reservoirs)	Current (3 reservoirs)
Annual charges.....	\$3, 023, 000	\$2, 351, 000
Annual benefits:		
Flood control.....	4, 334, 000	3, 139, 000
Increase in land use.....	140, 000	91, 000
Total.....	4, 474, 000	3, 230, 000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	¹ 1. 44	² 1. 37

¹ Project ratios vary from 1.17 to 1.69.

² 1.17 to 1.68.

Remarks: The three additional reservoirs recommended by the Chief of Engineers, with the First Fork Reservoir under construction by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, constitute an integrated system for the partial control of floods in the West Branch of the basin. They are economically justified by probable benefits as workable and interrelated units in a reservoir system designed to provide for control of major tributaries. These projects can, in the future, be supplemented by additional storage in large or small dams, as found warranted after further study.

REELFOOT LAKE AREA, TENNESSEE AND KENTUCKY

(Report of Chief of Engineers, June 17, 1954)

Location: The Reelfoot Basin, situated on the east bank of the Mississippi River, extends 35 miles in a southerly direction between Hickman, Ky., and the Obion River, tributary of the Mississippi River, in Tennessee.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted December 20, 1950.

Existing project: The project for Mississippi River and tributaries authorized by the act of May 15, 1928, as amended, provides for the extension of the Tiptonville-Obion River levee about 28 miles; channel improvement and diversion of Obion River; enlargement of lower 7.5 miles of Running Reelfoot Bayou; and excavation of Lake No. 9 and Harris Ditch diversion canals into Reelfoot Lake and Running Reelfoot Bayou, respectively. About 8 miles of levee have been constructed.

Plan of recommended improvement: Enlargement of Running Reelfoot Bayou and Bayou du Chien.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
March 1954 price level.....	\$748, 100	\$407, 200	\$1, 155, 300

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction; provide all State, county, and farm bridges included in plan of improvement; and maintain and operate the completed improvements.

Project economics:

	Current
Annual charges.....	\$62, 640
Annual benefits.....	\$242, 300
Benefit-cost ratio.....	3. 87

Remarks: The proposed channel improvements on Running Reelfoot Bayou and Bayou du Chien are important remedial measures which will afford relief from flood damages and impaired drainage over a large area, including Reelfoot Lake.

BELTON RESERVOIR, TEX.

This amendment is explained by the following letter from the Department of the Army:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington 25, D. C., July 22, 1954.

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed herewith a draft of legislation to modify the Flood Control Act of 1946 to provide for the reservation of 12,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood, Tex., and adjacent military installations. The submission of this legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide the Secretary of the Army authority to make available to Fort Hood 12,000 acre-feet of storage space in the Belton Reservoir project on the Leon River, Tex., without the added expense of transferring funds. The project is being constructed with funds appropriated for civil works activities of the Army.

The Belton Dam and Reservoir project is nearing completion and is being built by the Corps of Engineers under authority contained in the Flood Control Act of 1946, which authorized the project for flood control and conservation purposes with a proviso reading as follows: "Of the conservation storage capacity provided by such reservoir, not to exceed forty-five thousand acre-feet of such capacity shall be available for irrigation purposes in the Leon, Lampasas, and Little River Valleys." The project, presently estimated to cost \$14,300,000, will provide a controlled storage capacity of 1,097,600 acre-feet, including 887,000 for flood control, 125,700 for conservation and 84,900 for sedimentation storage. Of the 125,700 acre-feet of conservation storage space, 113,700 will be made available to the Brazos River Authority in accordance with authority contained in section 6 of the 1944 Flood Control Act, and the Secretary of the Army has tentatively reserved 12,000 acre-feet of storage space for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations.

After a thorough study of the water supply situation at Fort Hood by the district engineer, Fort Worth District, it was determined that to assure adequate amounts of water for present and future operations of Fort Hood it would be advisable to obtain 12,000 acre-feet of water supply storage space. It was found that Belton Reservoir would be the most dependable source of water supply both as to quantity and quality. In this connection, the Department of the Army is now in the process of constructing intake facilities, a treatment plant, and transmission line to treat and deliver water from the Belton Reservoir to the Fort Hood distribution system. In anticipation of the transfer of 12,000 acre-feet of storage space at Fort Hood, the district engineer, Fort Worth, is making application to the Board of Water Engineers of the State of Texas for the right to impound 12,000 acre-feet of water from the Leon River, Tex. Since the Chief of Engineers is without authority to transfer 12,000 acre-feet of storage space to the Fourth Army without reimbursement, it is recommended that the proposed legislation be enacted into law.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SLEZAK,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

LEGISLATION PROPOSED FOR INCLUSION IN THE RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL

Brazos River Basin: The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby modified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of 12,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations.

PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TEXAS AND NEW MEXICO

(Report of Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, March 26, 1954)

Location: Pecos River rises in central New Mexico and flows southeasterly for 525 miles in eastern New Mexico and 401 miles in western Texas to enter the Rio Grande on the Mexican border.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Acts of 1938, 1939, and 1950.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Improvement of Pecos River, Tex. and N. Mex., by construction of Los Esteros Reservoir, modification of Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir, and integrated operation of the two reservoirs by the Chief of Engineers; construction of local flood-protection works at and in the vicinities of Pecos, Tex., and Artesia, N. Mex.

Estimate of cost (June 1953 price levels):

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Los Esteros and Alamogordo Reservoir project-----	\$7, 000, 000	-----	\$7, 000, 000
Flood protection:			
Pecos, Tex-----	2, 000, 000	\$400, 000	2, 400, 000
Artesia, N. Mex-----	540, 000	160, 000	700, 000

Local cooperation: For Los Esteros and Alamogordo Reservoirs project: Consent of Carlsbad Irrigation District to the transfer of irrigation storage capacity from Alamogordo Reservoir to Los Esteros Reservoir, and to exclusive use of Alamogordo Reservoir for flood-control purposes unless detailed studies indicate that a limited storage allocation to irrigation may be feasible and would not adversely affect its operation for flood control; continue to fulfill its repayment obligations to the United States; participate in maintenance and operation costs in an amount equal to what it is now obligated to pay toward maintenance of Alamogordo Reservoir, estimated at \$10,000 annually. For local protection works at Pecos and Artesia: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including alterations to existing improvements, other than railroads; hold and save the United States free from damage, including damage which may result from temporary ponding of interior drainage and effects on sewage systems; maintain and operate all works after completion.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	<i>Current</i>
Los Esteros and Alamogordo-----	\$288, 000
Pecos, Tex-----	91, 000
Artesia, N. Mex-----	28, 000
Annual benefits:	
Los Esteros and Alamogordo-----	397, 000
Pecos, Tex-----	189, 000
Artesia, N. Mex-----	79, 000
Benefit-cost ratio:	
Los Esteros and Alamogordo-----	1. 38
Pecos, Tex-----	2. 08
Artesia, N. Mex-----	2. 82

Remarks: Construction of Los Esteros Reservoir should not be started until a satisfactory agreement is reached by the State of New Mexico, the Carlsbad Irrigation District, and other interests involved, concerning the transfer of storage between Los Esteros and Alamogordo Reservoirs.

28 AUTHORIZE CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

ARKANSAS RIVER, CONWAY COUNTY DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT
NO. 1, ARKANSAS

(H. Doc. 167, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Conway County Drainage and Levee District No. 1 is located in central Arkansas about 6 miles southwest of Morrilton, Ark. It extends along the right bank of the Arkansas River between river miles 227.3 and 225.5.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives adopted April 20, 1948.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project to provide local flood protection for this locality. However, reservoirs to be constructed under the multiple-purpose plan for the Arkansas Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938 and the River and Harbor Act of 1946, and other acts, will reduce flood flows in the area.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of a levee along the right bank of the Arkansas River from mile 227.3 to mile 225.5, together with a drainage structure and a drainage ditch.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$166,600	\$14,400	\$181,000
Current.....	230,600	18,400	249,000

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements and rights-of-way; either contribute to the United States the cost of construction of the proposed drainage ditch or undertake its construction at their own expense in accordance with plans of the district engineer; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate all the works after completion; and make any alterations to existing improvements which may be required because of the construction works.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges	\$12,600	\$13,900
Annual benefits	\$13,000	\$14,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.03	1.01

Remarks: The recommended plan of improvement will protect 1,490 acres of rural land, of which 850 are cultivated against design flood. The Corps of Engineers advises that if the project is authorized the economics will be carefully considered before construction funds are requested, in view of the relatively low benefit-cost ratio.

ARKANSAS RIVER, HOLLA BEND BOTTOM, ARK.

(H. Doc. 157, 82d Cong., 1st sess.)

Location: Holla Bend Bottom, which is known locally as Holly Bend Bottom, is located in Pope County, Ark., and extends along the left bank of the Arkansas River between river miles 255.3 and 241.9.

No towns are located in the area, in which agriculture is the only industry. Principal crops are cotton, soybeans, corn, and hay.

Report authorized by: Resolution of the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives, adopted April 19, 1946.

Existing project: There is no existing Federal project to provide local flood protection for Holla Bend Bottom. However, reservoirs to be constructed under the multiple-purpose plan for the Arkansas Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938 and the River and Harbor Act of 1946, and other acts, will reduce peak flood flows in the area.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for construction of a levee, along the left bank of the Arkansas River from mile 250.5 to mile 255.3 with necessary structures for interior drainage.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document.....	\$252,000	\$23,000	\$275,000
Current.....	312,000	23,000	335,000

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make any alterations to existing improvements that may be required; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate all the works after completion.

Project economics:

	Project document	Current
Annual charges.....	\$13,100	\$12,900
Annual benefits.....	13,700	15,900
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.05	1.23

Remarks: The recommended plan of improvement will protect about 1,990 acres in Holla Bend Drainage and Levee District No. 2, of which 1,570 acres are now in cultivation. The Corps of Engineers advises that if the project is authorized, the economics will be reexamined before construction is undertaken.

BEAR CREEK, MO.: LOCAL PROTECTION AT HANNIBAL, MO.

(H. Doc. 435, 83d Cong.)

Location: Hannibal is on the Mississippi River in northeastern Missouri. Bear Creek rises in Marion County, Mo., and flows easterly to its junction with the Mississippi River. The lower 3 miles are within the city of Hannibal.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted June 24, 1947, and House Flood Control Committee resolution adopted September 18, 1944.

Existing project: None in Bear Creek Basin. Lock and Dam No. 22 of the 9-foot Mississippi River navigation project is located 7 miles upstream of Hannibal.

Plan of recommended improvement: Construction of a dam and reservoir and appurtenant works on Bear Creek for reduction of flood damages in Hannibal, Mo.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Project document (December 1951)-----	\$2, 822, 200	\$153, 500	\$2, 975, 700
Current (October 1953)-----	3, 326, 000	189, 600	3, 515, 600

Local cooperation: Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; pay the cost of all necessary relocations except railroad relocation; maintain and operate project; and prevent encroachment which would reduce flood carrying capacity of Bear Creek in Hannibal.

Project economics:

	Project documents	Current
Annual charges-----	\$129, 600	\$135, 100
Annual benefits-----	190, 700	206, 400
Benefit-cost ratio-----	1. 47	1. 53

Remarks: Flash floods occur frequently on Bear Creek and cause extensive damages to industrial and residential property in Hannibal. Since the benefits are entirely local, participation by local interests in the cost of the project has been recommended in the form of furnishing all lands and certain relocations.

BIG SIOUX RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES, IOWA AND SOUTH DAKOTA

(Report of Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, March 15, 1954)

Location: Rises in northeastern South Dakota, flows southward to its confluence with the Missouri River just above Sioux City, Iowa.

Report authorized by: Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, resolution adopted March 20, 1944.

Existing project: No existing Federal flood-control project. A harbor project of the Big Sioux River just above its mouth, authorized as part of the Missouri River navigation project, has not yet been constructed. Local interests at various places have constructed levees and channel improvements mostly of minor scope with negligible effect on flood flows.

Plan of recommended improvement: Flood protection for Sioux Falls, S. Dak., by means of channel improvement, levees, and a diversion of a major part of Big Sioux River flood flows to bypass most of the city.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
As of April 1953-----	\$3, 430, 000	\$514, 000	\$3, 944, 000

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold United States free from damages; and maintain and operate the project.

Project economics:

		Report
Annual charges:		
Federal	-----	\$121, 000
Non-Federal	-----	31, 100
Total		-----
		152, 100
Annual benefits: Flood control		-----
		176, 400
Benefit-cost ratio		-----
		1. 16

Remarks: A serious flood menace exists at Sioux Falls and the project is urgently needed to protect lives and property.

COLD BROOK DAM, S. DAK.

The purpose of this amendment is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army through the Chief of Engineers, to compensate the owners of water wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam, S. Dak., for losses sustained by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result, wholly or partially, of the construction and operation of Cold Brook Dam.

During the construction of the Cold Brook Dam the waters of Cold Brook were diverted to bypass the construction areas, and returned to the stream bed below the dam. For most of the period of construction the supply of water to the wells below the dam was adequate; however, for a short time it was necessary to cut the flow of Cold Brook off altogether. The water level of the wells below the dam were not affected until completion of the cutoff trench and grout curtain in May 1951. Since that time the water supply in eight wells in the valley area below the Cold Brook Dam has been greatly reduced.

The construction of the dam appears to have had considerable effect on the availability of water in the alluvium below the dam from which the wells receive their supply. After a longer period of time elapses from the date of the water-supply shortage, it may be possible to determine whether the alluvium below the dam will return to its former capacity. However, some loss has been sustained, but it is difficult to ascertain such loss at this time. The estimated cost of permanent replacement of the 8 wells known to be affected or the extension of the city water system to the properties is about \$15,000.

A bill, S. 546, was reported by the committee on February 19, 1954, and passed the Senate on March 2, 1954. (S. Rept. No. 988, 83d Cong.)

OAHE RESERVOIR, S. DAK.

(Facilities at Pollock, S. Dak.)

The Oahe Reservoir was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944, and is now under construction. The town of Pollock, with a population of about 400, is on the Missouri River within the Oahe Reservoir area, and will have to be relocated in connection with the construction of the reservoir. The water supply is obtained from individual wells, and tile drains and septic tanks are used for sewage disposal facilities.

In the acquisition of the townsite, the property owners will be compensated for the appraised valuation of their individual water and sewage facilities. The wells at the present time are only required to be about 25 feet deep. In the new location of the town it will be necessary for the wells to be approximately 200 feet deep. The

committee feels that the property owners should be compensated for the additional cost of providing similar facilities at the new location of the town. Payment for these facilities will be made from regular appropriations for construction of the Oahe Reservoir.

HEART RIVER AT MANDAN, N. DAK.

(Report of Chief of Engineers dated July 27, 1954)

Location: Rises in southwestern North Dakota, and flows easterly approximately 241 miles to its confluence with the Missouri River about 6 miles southeast of Mandan, N. Dak.

Report authorized by: Senate Public Works Committee resolution, June 1, 1948.

Existing project: Provides for construction of levees and appurtenant works along the left bank of the Heart River for the protection of municipal areas and along the right bank of the Heart River for the protection of the State training school.

Plan of recommended improvement: Additional flood protection for Mandan, N. Dak., including the reach, Sunny to Mandan, an area extending 3 miles upstream and the downstream reach, Mandan to mouth, a distance of about 3½ miles by means of channel improvement, levees, a highway bridge raise, a railroad bridge lifting device, highway embankment earth blanketing, and appurtenant structures.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
As of June 1953 -----	\$1, 727, 000	\$463, 830	\$2, 190, 830

Local cooperation: Raise the existing United States Highway 10 bridge and approaches west of Mandan; cooperate in construction of the Mandan interior drainage works, in addition to the usual assurances required.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	
Federal -----	\$60, 524
Non-Federal -----	21, 824
Total -----	82, 348
Annual benefits: Flood control -----	153, 300
Benefit-cost ratio -----	1. 86

Remarks: The committee is informed that the proposed plan of improvement offers a practicable solution to the flood problem existing at this time and is economically justified. Accordingly, language has been included in the bill providing for construction of the project.

SANTA MARIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CALIFORNIA

(H. Doc. 400, 83d Cong.)

Location: The Santa Maria River is formed by the confluence of the Cuyama and Sisquoc Rivers at Fugler's Point in Santa Barbara County, Calif. It flows generally westward 25 miles to the Pacific Ocean draining an area of 1,845 square miles.

Report authorized by: An act approved May 14, 1937, and Flood Control Act, August 28, 1937.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: A multiple-purpose reservoir at the Vaquero site, mile 8 on the Cuyama River to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, with levee and channel improvements along Santa Maria River and Bradley Canyon, to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

Estimated cost (October 1952 ¹):

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Reservoir.....	² \$16,982,000		² \$16,982,000
Levee and channel improvements.....	10,182,000	\$1,216,000	11,398,000
Total.....	27,164,000	1,216,000	28,380,000

¹ Report and current costs are same.

² Includes \$3,013,000 allocated to flood control.

Local cooperation: Reservoir: Agree to adjust water-rights claims resulting from operation of the reservoir. Levee and channel work: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save United States free of damages; pay all necessary railroad, highway, and utility relocations except railroad bridges and approaches; maintain and operate completed project; agree to adjust all water-rights claims resulting from operation of channel improvements.

Project economies:

	Report (October 1952)	Current (October 1953)
Annual charges:		
Federal:		
Interest and amortization.....	\$909,400	\$909,400
Maintenance.....	25,400	35,200
Non-Federal.....	89,300	94,600
Total.....	1,024,100	1,039,200
Annual benefits:		
Flood control.....	600,000	720,000
Conservation.....	1,310,700	1,310,700
Total.....	1,910,700	2,030,700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.87	1.95

Remarks: The committee notes that the project has a favorable cost-to-benefit ratio and accordingly recommends the adoption of the levee and channel improvement to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers at a presently estimated cost of \$10,182,000. This will form part of the overall plan if and when the reservoir is authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

SAN LORENZO RIVER, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 447, 83d Cong.)

Location: San Lorenzo River rises in the Santa Cruz Mountains and flows southeasterly about 20 miles to Monterey Bay. The drainage basin of 137 square miles is mountainous, reaching an altitude of 3,000 feet.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act of 1938.

Existing project: None. Some clearing and snagging has been performed under Flood Control Act of 1937.

Plan of recommended improvement: Levees and flood walls along San Lorenzo River, with minor channel improvement, and channel improvements and rectification for Branciforte Creek.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (February 1953).....	\$2,565,000	\$670,000	\$3,235,000
Current (October 1953).....	2,665,000	696,000	3,361,000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make necessary bridge and utility revisions and replacements or in lieu thereof contribute in cash the cost of that work; hold and save United States free of damage; maintain and operate completed work; prevent encroachment in project channels which would interfere with flood control.

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges:		
Federal: Interest and amortization.....	\$90,400	\$94,000
Non-Federal.....	36,400	37,900
Total.....	126,800	131,900
Annual benefits.....	143,000	161,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.13	1.22

Remarks: A cash contribution, presently estimated at \$227,500, should be made by local interests, in addition to the other requirements of local cooperation, in view of the local benefits from land enhancement. This amount should be recomputed prior to construction in accordance with the letter from the Bureau of the Budget in the project document.

SAN LORENZO CREEK, ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIF.

(H. Doc. 452, 83d Cong.)

Location: A small watershed in foothills of Coast Range Mountains on east side of San Francisco Bay. The stream flows through the town of Hayward and enters the bay 10 miles southeast of Oakland. The basin above Hayward has a drainage area of 45 square miles.

Report authorized by: Resolution adopted by the House Committee on Flood Control, May 14, 1945.

Existing project: None.

Plan of recommended improvement: Channel improvements, levees, and appurtenant works on San Lorenzo Creek in Hayward.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Report (December 1952).....	\$3,644,000	\$631,000	\$4,275,000
Current (October 1953).....	3,790,000	656,000	4,446,000

Local cooperation: Furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; make necessary bridge and utility alterations; hold and save United States free of damages; maintain and operate completed project, preventing encroachment on the channel; contribute in cash 2.6 percent of the cost of construction, presently estimated at \$96,000.

Project economics:

	Report	Current
Annual charges:		
Federal: Interest and amortization	\$129,000	\$129,400
Non-Federal.....	36,700	41,400
Total.....	165,700	173,800
Annual benefits:		
Flood control.....	179,200	247,500
Land enhancement.....	11,000	15,200
Bridge replacement.....	3,000	3,000
Total.....	193,200	265,700
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1.17	1.52

Remarks: In view of the favorable costs to benefits ratio and the need for improvements to alleviate the serious flood problem in this area, the committee has seen fit to include language in the bill authorizing construction of this project.

In view of the land-enhancement benefit, the committee believes that local interests should contribute in cash an amount equal to 2.6 percent of the cost of construction, presently estimated at \$96,000.

TRUCKEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA

(Report of Chief of Engineers, April 15, 1954)

Location: Truckee River begins at the outlet of Lake Tahoe near Truckee, Calif., and flows northerly and easterly through Reno, Nev., to Pyramid Lake.

Report authorized by: Flood Control Act, June 28, 1938.

Existing project: None. Clearing and snagging to extent of \$70,000 accomplished after 1950 flood with emergency funds.

Plan of recommended improvement: Provides for channel improvement below control structure at Lake Tahoe and downstream from Reno through Truckee Meadows.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
October 1953 price level.....	\$791,000	\$169,000	\$960,000

Local cooperation: Provide suitable debris-removal facilities at Derby Dam; furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction and relocate all roads and utilities required; hold and save the United States free from damages; and maintain and operate all works after completion:

Project economics:

Annual charges:	
Federal.....	\$28, 000
Non-Federal.....	23, 000
Total.....	51, 000
Annual benefits: Prevention of flood damages.....	82, 500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 62

Remarks: The improvement will provide needed flood control and will fit into a comprehensive plan now being developed for irrigation, power, and flood control. The committee feels, however, that the flood-control improvements should not proceed until the irrigation and power features, known as the Washoe reclamation project, are authorized.

AMAZON CREEK, OREG.

(S. Doc. 131, 83d Cong.)

Location: Amazon Creek rises in west central Oregon, 6 miles south of Eugene, and flows 24 miles generally north to a junction with Long Tom River at a point 15 miles above its confluence with Willamette River.

Report authorized by: Senate Committee on Public Works, October 14, 1949.

Existing project: Channel improvement through Eugene, downstream to a diversion structure above Clear Lake and a diversion canal from that point to Fern Ridge Reservoir. Improvement of the channel below the diversion structure to Long Tom River with major drainage ditches or laterals tributary thereto.

Plan of recommended improvement: Enlarge channel through Eugene with about 1 mile having concrete lining and guardrail. Improve channel from Eugene to a diversion structure about 3 miles upstream from Clear Lake, and a diversion structure and diversion canal therefrom to Fern Ridge Reservoir.

Estimated cost:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
July 1953 prices.....	\$893, 600	\$339, 090	\$1, 232, 690

Local cooperation: Provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way, construct necessary bridges, and make relocations; hold and save United States free from damage; maintain and operate project; and contribute in cash 11.5 percent of the construction cost currently estimated at \$56,400.

Project economics:

Annual charges:	
Federal.....	\$31, 530
Non-Federal.....	18, 740
Total.....	50, 270
Annual benefits:	
Flood control.....	66, 500
Increased land use.....	30, 700
Advance bridge replacement.....	1, 300
Total.....	98, 500
Benefit-cost ratio.....	1. 96

Remarks: The remaining work to be done under the recommended modified project is the completion of the enlarged channel through Eugene at an estimated construction cost of \$490,000 of which \$350,000 would be a Federal cost. The benefit-to-cost ratio for the remaining work is 1.26.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEY ITEMS ADDED

SECTION 204

- Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Connecticut.
- Devils River and tributaries, Texas.
- Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico.



Calendar No. 2026

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9859

[Report No. 2007]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Reported by Mr. MARTIN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

4 SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of
5 rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood
6 control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and author-
7 ized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary
8 of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in
9 accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions

1 recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective
2 reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provi-
3 sions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved
4 March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Con-
5 gress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects
6 authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth
7 with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of
8 improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
9 tion and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein
10 set forth in full:

11 Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered
12 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

13 Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and
14 New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-
15 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

16 Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash
19 the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the
20 Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently
21 estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

22 Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$4,400,000;

25 Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document

1 Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$525,000;

3 Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
4 bered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$375,000;

6 Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document
7 Numbered 405, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$694,000;

9 Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document
10 Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$166,400;

12 Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Num-
13 bered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in
15 cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently
16 estimated as \$23,000;

17 Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Num-
18 bered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$135,000;

20 Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut:
21 House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$112,500;

23 Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$32,200;

1 Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered
2 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$31,928,000;

4 Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House
5 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an
6 estimated cost of \$138,000;

7 Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document
8 Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$1,973,900;

10 *Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Dela-*
11 *ware: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board*
12 *of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document*
13 *Numbered 358, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
14 *of \$91,389,000.*

15 Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Num-
16 bered 229, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$469,400;

18 Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake
19 Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered
20 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,-
21 000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution
22 for the construction of all bridges, including approaches
23 thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard
24 heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

25 Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document

1 Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$31,900;

3 Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Mary-
4 land: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

6 Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland:
7 House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$29,000;

9 Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland:
10 House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$192,600;

12 Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House
13 Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
14 mated cost of \$20,300;

15 Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Num-
16 bered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required
18 of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs
19 between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

20 Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland:
21 House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$45,100;

23 Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Num-
24 bered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$678,300;

1 Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay,
2 Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second
3 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

4 Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered
5 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

6 Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia:
7 Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

9 Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Docu-
10 ment Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
11 cost of \$95,000;

12 Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered
13 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

14 Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina:
15 House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at
16 an estimated cost of \$108,000;

17 Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Num-
18 bered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$102,000;

20 Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson
21 Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411,
22 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

23 Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Water-
24 way: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

1 *The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor*
2 *North Carolina, authorized by the River and Harbor Act*
3 *approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommenda-*
4 *tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-*
5 *bered 87, Eighty-first Congress, is hereby further modified*
6 *to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse*
7 *local interests for such work as they may have done upon*
8 *widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the*
9 *anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the*
10 *same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found*
11 *to have been done in accordance with the project modifica-*
12 *tion adopted in said Act, provided that such payment shall*
13 *not exceed the sum of \$65,000.*

14 *Charleston Harbor, South Carolina: Senate Document*
15 *Numbered 136, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
16 *of \$200,000.*

17 *Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina:*
18 *House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at*
19 *an estimated cost of \$765,000;*

20 *Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered*
21 *110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;*

22 *Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Docu-*
23 *ment Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-*
24 *mated cost of \$82,200;*

1 Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered
2 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;

3 *Carabelle Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered*
4 *451, Eighty-third Congress (maintenance of existing*
5 *channel);*

6 Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
7 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
8 \$98,000;

9 Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George
10 Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second
11 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

12 St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
13 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$1,312,000;

15 Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered
16 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$5,778,000;

18 Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Num-
19 bered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$70,000;

21 *Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: Modification of exist-*
22 *ing project in accordance with plans on file in the Office of*
23 *the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000;*

24 Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Docu-

1 ment Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
2 cost of \$520,000;

3 Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document
4 Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
5 of \$6,875,000;

6 Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document
7 Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$74,300;

9 Aransas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intra-
10 coastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-
11 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

12 Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654,
13 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

14 Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House
15 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
16 mated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already per-
17 formed by local interests on this project, in accordance with
18 recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribu-
19 tion required of local interests;

20 *Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: In*
21 *accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated*
22 *May 24, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$180,000;*

23 Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Docu-

1 ment Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
2 mated cost of \$82,600;

3 Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document
4 Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
5 of \$65,000;

6 Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House
7 Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
8 mated cost of \$142,000;

9 Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate
10 Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a
11 monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of
12 the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document
13 Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland
14 River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", au-
15 thorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is
16 hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment
17 of the project hereby approved;

18 Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Docu-
19 ment Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
20 cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system
21 work;

22 Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document
23 Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional esti-
24 mated cost of \$219,900;

25 Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Num-

bered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;

Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$217,200;

Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required by the project document;

Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Document Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$225,000;

Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 29, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000;

Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$174,000;

Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

1 Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New
2 York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Con-
3 gress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900:

4 Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Num-
5 bered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
6 \$2,459,000;

7 Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California:
8 House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress,
9 at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secre-
10 tary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local
11 interests for such work as they may have done upon this
12 project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests
13 insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-
14 neers and found to have been done in accordance with the
15 project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such re-
16 imbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable
17 thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take pre-
18 cedence over other pending projects of higher priority for
19 harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such
20 payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

21 Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California:
22 House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress:
23 *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of
24 entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and cen-
25 tral basin recommended in the project report and presently

1 estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum
2 of the cost thereof;

3 Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered
4 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$5,437,000;

6 *Richmond Harbor, California: House Document Num-*
7 *bered 395, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of*
8 *\$2,086,000;*

9 Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate
10 Document Numbered 83, Eight-third Congress, at an esti-
11 mated cost of \$3,758,700;

12 Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reeds-
13 port, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-
14 first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

15 *Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document*
16 *Numbered 128, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
17 *of \$1,500,000;*

18 Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington:
19 House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at
20 an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

21 Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the
22 head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-
23 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

24 Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washing-

1 ton: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Con-
2 gress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

3 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House
4 Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
5 mated cost of \$421,800;

6 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Break-
7 water), Washington: ~~House Document Numbered —,~~
8 ~~Eighty-third Congress,~~ *in accordance with the report of*
9 *the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954,* at an
10 estimated cost of \$323,700;

11 Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Num-
12 bered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$179,300;

14 Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered
15 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$139,250;

17 Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document
18 Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
19 cost of \$1,366,650;

20 Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Num-
21 bered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 \$436,000;

23 Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document
24 Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
25 of \$3,397,300;

1 *Tacoma Harbor, Washington: Modification of existing*
2 *project to provide for thirty-foot channel in Port Industrial*
3 *(Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in*
4 *the Office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of*
5 *\$634,200;*

6 Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document
7 Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$477,900;

9 Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington:
10 House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$395,500;

12 Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Num-
13 bered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
14 \$425,550;

15 *Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
16 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500;*

17 *Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
18 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800;*

19 *Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
20 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400;*

21 Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
22 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

23 Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered
24 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

25 *Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered*

1 465, *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of*
2 *\$1,685,000;*

3 Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Docu-
4 ment Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
5 cost of \$3,022,000;

6 *Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, Territory of Ha-*
7 *waii: House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-third Con-*
8 *gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400;*

9 BEACH EROSION

10 Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document
11 Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
12 of \$140,000;

13 Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
14 Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
15 of \$189,000;

16 Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$402,900;

19 Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
20 Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
21 cost of \$409,000;

22 South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document
23 Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
24 of \$166,550;

1 Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecti-
2 cut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress,
3 at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach;
4 \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

5 New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3),
6 Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third
7 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect
8 Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf
9 Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

10 Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut:
11 House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at
12 an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000
13 for Seaside Park;

14 Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
15 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$2,044,000;

17 Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
18 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$105,000;

20 Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey:
21 House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$260,000;

1 Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered
2 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

3 Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered
4 380, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

5 Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Num-
6 bered 28, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
7 ~~\$1,176,400~~ \$1,180,400;

8 Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Docu-
9 ment Numbered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
10 cost of \$185,000;

11 Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Num-
12 bered 502, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White
14 City Park;

15 Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House
16 Document Numbered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an
17 estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

18 Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York:
19 House Document Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at
20 an estimated cost of \$136,500;

21 Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House
22 Document Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
23 mated cost of \$3,874,000;

24 Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document

1 Numbered 349, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

3 Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Docu-
4 ment Numbered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
5 cost of \$73,700;

6 Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document
7 Numbered 227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$283,700.

9 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
10 ized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them
11 on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, sub-
12 sequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which
13 form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work
14 which may have been done on these projects was approved
15 by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
16 projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reim-
17 bursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable there-
18 to for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence
19 over other pending projects of higher priority for improve-
20 ments.

21 SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
22 ized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and
23 survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from
24 the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, in the

1 vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable pro-
2 visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

3 *SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-*
4 *ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and*
5 *surveys to be made at the following-named localities, and*
6 *subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River*
7 *and Harbor Act of 1950:*

8 *Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland,*
9 *Maine;*

10 *Southwest Harbor, Maine;*

11 *Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine;*

12 *Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Chocta-*
13 *watchee Bay, Florida, in the vicinity of Point Wash-*
14 *ington;*

15 *Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Florida, to*
16 *determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective*
17 *measures with respect thereto; and*

18 *Chipola River, Florida, for measures to maintain*
19 *satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes.*

20 *SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to*
21 *the city of Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their*
22 *successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend*
23 *Channel, in the county of Mobile, Alabama, by the construc-*
24 *tion and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said*
25 *channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama:*

1 *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be com-
2 menced until the plans and location therefor have been filed
3 with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States
4 Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision
5 shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the
6 causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years
7 and completed within five years from the date of this Act and
8 the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby
9 expressly reserved.

10 *SEC. 105. The authorization of the improvement of the*
11 *Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosatchee River to the*
12 *Anclote River (House Document Numbered 371, Seventy-*
13 *fifth Congress) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of*
14 *1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and*
15 *the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as*
16 *to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and*
17 *Lemon Bay, Florida, area, as designated in plans of the*
18 *Corps of Engineers.*

19 *The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Con-*
20 *gress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part*
21 *of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of*
22 *local contribution in the light of the changed condition.*
23 *Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommenda-*
24 *tions shall become effective when approved by the Public*

1 *Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Repre-*
 2 *sentatives.*

3 *SEC. 106. That the requirement, that local interests pro-*
 4 *vide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across*
 5 *the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and*
 6 *harbor project authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935*
 7 *(49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Mississippi, below*
 8 *Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: Provided, That local*
 9 *interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of*
 10 *the Army that they will hold and save the United States free*
 11 *from any claim for damage which might result from depriva-*
 12 *tion of access to the area.*

13 *SEC. ~~105~~ 107. Title I may be cited as the "River and*
 14 *Harbor Act of 1954".*

15 TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

16 *SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22,*
 17 *1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as*
 18 *amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938*
 19 *(Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall*
 20 *apply to all works authorized in this title except that for*
 21 *any channel improvement or channel rectification project,*
 22 *provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of*
 23 *June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise*
 24 *provided by law: Provided, That the authorization for any*
 25 *flood-control project herein adopted requiring local coopera-*

tion shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the following provisions shall be observed:

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the

1 Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in ac-
2 cordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-
3 after designated and subject to the conditions set forth
4 therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications,
5 and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project
6 authorized in this title with funds from appropriations here-
7 tofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready
8 for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*
9 *further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated
10 as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be con-
11 sistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*,
12 That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible
13 future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall
14 be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construc-
15 tion by the Department of the Army when approved by
16 the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the
17 Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

18 CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

19 That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecti-
20 cut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936
21 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
22 amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide
23 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of
24 the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers,
25 of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene,

1 New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs here-
2 tofore authorized.

3 That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecti-
4 cut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three
5 reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend
6 sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in
7 section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December
8 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to
9 by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers,
10 and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in
11 June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the
12 eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control
13 Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

14 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

15 The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity
16 of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby
17 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
18 tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-
19 bered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$4,469,000.

21 *The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of*
22 *the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania and New York, is*
23 *hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recom-*
24 *mendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated*

1 *June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appro-*
2 *priated the sum of \$25,000,000 for partial accomplishment*
3 *of that plan.*

4 CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

5 The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood
6 control and other purposes in central and southern Florida
7 given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as
8 amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the
9 entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended
10 by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered
11 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof
12 as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the dis-
13 cretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the author-
15 ized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control
16 Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all
17 work over and beyond that previous authorization such
18 conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they
19 shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress,
20 based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest
21 practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the
22 Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*,
23 That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established
24 by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be
25 retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan author-

1 ized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment
2 of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided*
3 *further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is
4 hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000
5 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

6 LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

7 The project for flood control and improvement of the
8 lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15.
9 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified
10 and expanded to include the following items of work and the
11 authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

12 (a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock
13 for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of
14 the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated
15 February 2, 1954, as ~~concurred in by~~ *and* the report of the
16 Chief of Engineers dated April 8, 1954 in *House Document*
17 *Numbered 478, Eighty-third Congress*, with such modifica-
18 tions as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find ad-
19 visable at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navi-
20 gation lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000
21 increase in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under
22 the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the
23 Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which
24 \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this
25 paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire

1 such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be
2 necessary for construction of the project except that local
3 interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the
4 Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended,
5 with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main
6 line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Pro-*
7 *vided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by
8 the United States in connection with this item: *And pro-*
9 *vided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the
10 required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engi-
11 neers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds
12 herein authorized to be appropriated.

13 (b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Missis-
14 sippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City,
15 Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the
16 Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53,
17 Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of
18 \$440,000.

19 (c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicks-
20 burg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report
21 of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85,
22 Eighty-third Congress.

23 (d) Modification of the authorized project for the New
24 Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the rec-
25 ommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document

1 Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$1,743,000.

3 *(e) The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake Area,*
4 *Tennessee and Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the*
5 *recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated*
6 *June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100.*

7 BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEXAS

8 The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide
9 flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as author-
10 ized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939,
11 and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in ac-
12 cordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
13 neers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third
14 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

15 BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

16 The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the
17 Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek,
18 Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
19 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
20 Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there
21 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,-
22 000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

23 *The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Texas,*
24 *authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby mod-*

1 *ified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of*
2 *twelve thousand acre-feet of conservation storage to be used*
3 *as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and*
4 *adjacent military installations.*

5 GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

6 The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and
7 San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substan-
8 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
9 Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third
10 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

11 GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

12 The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas,
13 authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act author-
14 izing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain
15 public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes",
16 approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such au-
17 thorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and
18 Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction,
19 operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secre-
20 tary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers
21 of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the
22 provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir
23 shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approx-
24 imately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which
25 three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for

1 flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood con-
2 trol, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for
3 sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of develop-
4 ment of electric power, at an estimated total cost of
5 \$13,300,000.

6 The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Fed-
7 eral Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate
8 to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation,
9 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may
10 appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-
11 flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such
12 allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable
13 costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net
14 increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage
15 capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and
16 Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation.
17 No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for
18 development of electric power shall be made under this sec-
19 tion unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such in-
20 stallation will actually be constructed.

21 The costs allocated to local interests under this section
22 shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by
23 them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act.
24 The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engi-
25 neers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon

1 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the
2 appropriation available for maintenance and operation of
3 such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such
4 operation and maintenance ; the \$1,400,000 to be con-
5 tributed during the construction period shall be deposited to
6 the credit of the appropriation available for construction of
7 the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that pur-
8 pose; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief
9 of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon
10 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of
11 the United States.

12 Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon
13 Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by
14 the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance
15 with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accord-
16 ance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, opera-
17 tion, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local
18 interests and with such power to be made available to such
19 local interests.

20 Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward
21 the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir,
22 \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time
23 or times during the period of such construction, as the
24 Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the
25 contributions allocated to local interests ~~under section 2,~~ with

1 interest thereon at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per annum,
2 shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over
3 a period not in excess of fifty years.

4 The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement
5 with local interests providing for the payments heretofore
6 described and for all other matters relating to the operation
7 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which
8 require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement
9 may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water
10 conservation and stream-flow regulation for development
11 of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide
12 that the utilization of water for power development shall not
13 be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimenta-
14 tion purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

15 *PECOS RIVER BASIN*

16 *The project for flood protection on the Pecos River,*
17 *Texas and New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in*
18 *accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engi-*
19 *neers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at*
20 *an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: Provided, That no appro-*
21 *priations shall be made for construction of Los Esteros*
22 *Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by*
23 *the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage*
24 *from the Alamagordo Reservoir.*

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized sub-

1 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
2 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185,
3 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

4 *The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River,*
5 *Conway County Drainage and Levee District Numbered 1,*
6 *Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance*
7 *with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House*
8 *Document Numbered 167, Eighty-second Congress, at an*
9 *estimated cost of \$230,600.*

10 *The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River,*
11 *Holla Bend Bottom, Arkansas, is hereby authorized sub-*
12 *stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the*
13 *Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157,*
14 *Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$312,000.*

15 UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

16 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River
17 in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized sub-
18 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
19 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397,
20 Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of
21 \$2,500,000.

22 *The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Han-*
23 *nibal, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-*

1 *ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers*
2 *in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-third Congress,*
3 *at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000.*

4 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River,
5 Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby au-
6 thorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
7 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
8 Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the
9 improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Hen-
10 derson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost
11 for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

12 The project for flood protection on the Missis-
13 sippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8,
14 Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially
15 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
16 Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third
17 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

18 The project on the Mississippi River for local flood
19 protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illi-
20 nois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
21 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
22 Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
23 mated cost of \$7,046,300.

24 The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa
25 River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance

1 with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
2 Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an
3 estimated cost of \$979,600.

4 MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

5 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
6 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for
7 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri
8 River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers,
9 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and
10 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

11 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
12 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
13 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
14 project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tribu-
15 taries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in
16 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
17 neers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Con-
18 gress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and
19 there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition
20 to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

21 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
22 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
23 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
24 project for flood protection on the Osage River and tribu-
25 taries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with

1 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House
2 Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

3 The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June
4 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys,
5 Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood
6 Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modi-
7 fied to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute
8 not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of
9 flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the
10 lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Pro-*
11 *vided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal
12 Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of
13 the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor
14 shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project
15 reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-
16 of-way, and public relocations which local interests would
17 have been required to bear had the approved Government
18 plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total
19 amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the
20 work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

21 The project for flood protection on the Chariton River,
22 Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in
23 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
24 neers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

1 *The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River*
2 *and tributaries at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, is hereby*
3 *authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-*
4 *tions of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in*
5 *its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of*
6 *\$3,430,000.*

7 The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux
8 River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is
9 hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accord-
10 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers,
11 in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress,
12 at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

13 *The Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engi-*
14 *neers, is authorized and directed to compensate the owners of*
15 *water wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam in South*
16 *Dakota for losses determined by him to have been sustained*
17 *by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells*
18 *as a result, wholly or partially, of the construction and*
19 *operation of Cold Brook Dam: Provided, That claims for*
20 *losses compensable under this section shall be submitted not*
21 *later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act,*
22 *or not later than two years after the lowering of the level*
23 *of water which is the basis for the claim, whichever is the*
24 *later.*

25 *The general comprehensive plans for flood control and*

1 *other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House*
2 *Document Numbered 475 and Senate Document Numbered*
3 *191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document Num-*
4 *bered 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved*
5 *in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby*
6 *modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers*
7 *for construction or provision of adequate water supply and*
8 *sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pol-*
9 *lock, South Dakota, at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which*
10 *is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities*
11 *in the town which are located within areas which have been*
12 *or will be acquired by the United States because of the*
13 *construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the*
14 *basin.*

15 The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri
16 River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby
17 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
18 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Num-
19 bered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
20 \$212,300.

21 *The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart*
22 *River in the vicinity of Mandan, North Dakota, authorized by*
23 *the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Con-*
24 *trol Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accord-*
25 *ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers*

1 *in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost*
2 *of \$1,727,000.*

3 COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

4 The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and
5 tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in
6 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
7 neers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second
8 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

9 OHIO RIVER BASIN

10 The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek
11 at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is
12 hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the
13 recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Docu-
14 ment Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
15 cost of \$570,000.

16 The project for flood control and related purposes on the
17 Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substan-
18 tially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in ~~House~~
19 ~~Document Numbered~~ ; ~~Eighty-third Congress~~ *his report*
20 *dated June 23, 1954,* at an estimated cost of \$1,001,300:
21 *Provided, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended*
22 *in that document, local interests shall comply with the pro-*
23 *visions of local cooperation contained in section 3 of the Flood*
24 *Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall*
25 *also construct and maintain local drainage works required to*

1 fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, gen-
2 erally as outlined in ~~House Document Numbered~~ , ~~Eighty-~~
3 ~~third Congress said document.~~

4 KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

5 The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo
6 River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized sub-
7 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
8 Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98,
9 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550:
10 *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will
11 be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the
12 Army contained in the aforesaid document.

13 LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

14 The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet
15 River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substan-
16 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
17 Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-
18 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

19 LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

20 In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby
21 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for
22 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los An-
23 geles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California,
24 approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and
25 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

SANTA MARIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Santa Maria River and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 400, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,182,000 for levees and channel improvements to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SAN LORENZO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 447, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,665,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control on the American River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-

1 neers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Con-
2 gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

3 LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

4 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
5 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for
6 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower
7 San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of
8 December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by sub-
9 sequent Acts of Congress.

10 SAN LORENZO CREEK BASIN

11 *The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo Creek,*
12 *Alameda County, California, is hereby authorized substan-*
13 *tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of*
14 *Engineers in House Document Numbered 452, Eighty-third*
15 *Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,790,000.*

16 TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

17 *The project for flood protection on Truckee River and*
18 *tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized sub-*
19 *stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief*
20 *of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an esti-*
21 *mated cost of \$791,000: Provided, That the authorization for*
22 *improvement for flood control on Truckee River, California*
23 *and Nevada, contained herein shall not become effective unless*
24 *and until the "Washoe Reclamation Project" on the Truckee*

1 *and Carson Rivers, California and Nevada, shall have been*
2 *authorized pursuant to law.*

3 COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

4 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
5 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for
6 the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia
7 River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was author-
8 ized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and
9 these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power
10 development in the following projects in tributary basins, sub-
11 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
12 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531,
13 Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of
14 McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on
15 Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White
16 Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam
17 River, Oregon.

18 *The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at*
19 *Eugene and vicinity, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Con-*
20 *trol Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of*
21 *1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with*
22 *the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 131,*
23 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$893,600.*

1 TERRITORY OF ALASKA

2 The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tribu-
3 taries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-
4 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in
5 House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress,
6 at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

7 TERRITORY OF HAWAII

8 The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream
9 and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii,
10 is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-
11 ommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
12 Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
13 of \$347,000.

14 SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
15 ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and sur-
16 veys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel
17 and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by
18 or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction
19 of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United
20 States and its Territorial possessions, which include the fol-
21 lowing-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or
22 formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or
23 work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no
24 supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made
25 unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the

1 Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to
2 be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such
3 review is required by the national defense or by changed
4 physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the
5 Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any
6 project for the improvement of any waterway or ~~harbor~~
7 *stream* mentioned in this ~~title~~ *section* until the project for
8 the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

9 Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

10 Neponset River, Massachusetts.

11 *Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Con-*
12 *necticut.*

13 Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Penn-
14 sylvania in the interest of flood control.

15 Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

16 *Devils River and tributaries, Texas.*

17 *Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico.*

18 Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

19 Coos Bay, Oregon.

20 SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the
21 sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated
22 for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the
23 prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be
24 carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of
25 December 22, 1944, as amended.

1 SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August
2 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Con-
3 gress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July
4 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress),
5 as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953
6 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby
7 still further amended to read as follows:

8 “That 75 per centum of all moneys received and de-
9 posited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal
10 year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the
11 United States for flood control, navigation, and allied pur-
12 poses, including the development of hydroelectric power,
13 shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the
14 Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to
15 be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the
16 benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or
17 counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying
18 any of the expenses of county government in such county
19 or counties, including public obligations of levee and drain-
20 age districts for flood control and drainage improvements:
21 *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than
22 one State or county, the distributive share to each from the
23 proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area
24 therein.”

1 SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act ap-
2 proved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

3 “That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as
4 required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter
5 made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related pur-
6 poses by the United States, for the establishment, operation,
7 and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of
8 recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as
9 the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the
10 Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau
11 such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary
12 examinations and surveys or works of improvement author-
13 ized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and
14 related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the
15 recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to
16 allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure.”

17 SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of
18 August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood
19 Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended
20 to read as follows:

21 “That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
22 allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations here-
23 tofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood
24 control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris,

1 and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable
2 streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the
3 Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of
4 flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall
5 be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from
6 the appropriations for any one fiscal year.”

7 SEC. ~~240~~ 209. That section 4 of the Act approved July
8 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress),
9 is amended to read as follows:

10 “The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
11 Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain,
12 and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir
13 areas under the control of the Department of the Army,
14 and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation
15 of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also author-
16 ized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities
17 thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such
18 terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in
19 the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organ-
20 izations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at
21 reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the pub-
22 lic service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises:
23 *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal,

1 State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases
2 where appropriate, may be granted without monetary con-
3 siderations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion
4 of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secre-
5 tary of the Army determines such action to be in the public
6 interest, and for such periods of time and upon such con-
7 ditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That
8 in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local
9 governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for
10 the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests,
11 or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be
12 authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be neces-
13 sary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize
14 the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the develop-
15 ment, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such
16 lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid
17 to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary
18 of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas
19 of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally,
20 without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and
21 other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit
22 from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs
23 shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is

1 determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary
2 to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations
3 as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use
4 of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted
5 which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish
6 and game of the State in which such area is situated. All
7 moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges
8 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as
9 miscellaneous receipts.”

10 SEC. ~~211~~ 210. Title II may be cited as the “Flood
11 Control Act of 1954”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1954.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

83d CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 9859

[Report No. 2007]

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

JULY 29 (legislative day, JULY 2), 1954

Reported with amendments

83^D CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 9859

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 17 (legislative day, AUGUST 5), 1954

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

4 SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of
5 rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood
6 control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and author-
7 ized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary
8 of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in
9 accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions

1 recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective
2 reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provi-
3 sions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved
4 March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Con-
5 gress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects
6 authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth
7 with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of
8 improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
9 tion and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein
10 set forth in full:

11 Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered
12 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

13 Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and
14 New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-
15 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

16 Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
17 bered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
18 \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash
19 the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the
20 Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently
21 estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

22 Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$4,400,000;

25 Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document

1 Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$525,000;

3 Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
4 bered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
5 \$375,000;

6 Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document
7 Numbered 405, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
8 of \$694,000;

9 Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document
10 Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$166,400;

12 Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Num-
13 bered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
14 of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in
15 cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently
16 estimated as \$23,000;

17 Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Num-
18 bered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$135,000;

20 Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut:
21 House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$112,500;

23 Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Num-
24 bered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$32,200;

1 Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered
2 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$31,928,000;

4 Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House
5 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an
6 estimated cost of \$138,000;

7 Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document
8 Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
9 cost of \$1,973,900;

10 **(1)***Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Dela-*
11 *ware: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board*
12 *of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document*
13 *Numbered 358, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
14 *of \$91,389,000.*

15 Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Num-
16 bered 229, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$469,400;

18 Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake
19 Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered
20 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,-
21 000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution
22 for the construction of all bridges, including approaches
23 thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard
24 heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

25 Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document

1 Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$31,900;

3 Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Mary-
4 land: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

6 Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland:
7 House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$29,000;

9 Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland:
10 House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at
11 an estimated cost of \$192,600;

12 Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House
13 Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
14 mated cost of \$20,300;

15 Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Num-
16 bered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required
18 of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs
19 between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

20 Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland:
21 House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at
22 an estimated cost of \$45,100;

23 Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Num-
24 bered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$678,300;

1 Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay,
2 Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second
3 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

4 Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered
5 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

6 Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia:
7 Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at
8 an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

9 Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Docu-
10 ment Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated
11 cost of \$95,000;

12 Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered
13 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

14 Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina:
15 House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at
16 an estimated cost of \$108,000;

17 Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Num-
18 bered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$102,000;

20 Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson
21 Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411,
22 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

23 Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Water-
24 way: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Con-
25 gress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

1 **(2)***The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor,*
2 *North Carolina, authorized by the River and Harbor Act*
3 *approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommenda-*
4 *tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-*
5 *bered 87, Eighty-first Congress, is hereby further modified*
6 *to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse*
7 *local interests for such work as they may have done upon*
8 *widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the*
9 *anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the*
10 *same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found*
11 *to have been done in accordance with the project modifica-*
12 *tion adopted in said Act, provided that such payment shall*
13 *not exceed the sum of \$65,000.*

14 **(3)***Charleston Harbor, South Carolina: Senate Document*
15 *Numbered 136, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
16 *of \$200,000.*

17 Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina:
18 House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at
19 an estimated cost of \$765,000;

20 Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered
21 110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900;

22 Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Docu-
23 ment Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
24 mated cost of \$82,200;

25 Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered

1 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600;
2 **(4)***Carrabelle Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered*
3 *451, Eighty-third Congress (maintenance of existing*
4 *channel);*

5 Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
6 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
7 \$98,000;

8 Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George
9 Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second
10 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

11 St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered
12 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
13 \$1,312,000;

14 Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered
15 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$5,778,000;

17 Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Num-
18 bered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$70,000;

20 **(5)***Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: Modification of exist-*
21 *ing project in accordance with plans on file in the Office of*
22 *the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000;*

23 Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Docu-
24 ment Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
25 cost of \$520,000;

1 Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document
 2 Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
 3 of \$6,875,000;

4 Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document
 5 Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
 6 of \$74,300;

7 Aransas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intra-
 8 coastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-
 9 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

10 Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654,
 11 Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

12 Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House
 13 Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
 14 mated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already per-
 15 formed by local interests on this project, in accordance with
 16 recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribu-
 17 tion required of local interests;

18 **(6)***Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House*
 19 *Document Numbered 487, Eighty-third Congress, at an*
 20 *estimated cost of \$180,000;*

21 Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Docu-
 22 ment Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an esti-
 23 mated cost of \$82,600;

24 Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document

1 Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
2 of \$65,000;

3 Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House
4 Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
5 mated cost of \$142,000;

6 Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate
7 Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a
8 monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of
9 the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document
10 Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland
11 River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", au-
12 thorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is
13 hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment
14 of the project hereby approved (7): *Provided that such*
15 *authorization shall include the acquisition of lands necessary*
16 *for wildlife purposes as outlined in said Senate Document*
17 *Numbered 81;*

18 Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Docu-
19 ment Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
20 cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system
21 work;

22 Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document
23 Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional esti-
24 mated cost of \$219,900;

25 Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Num-

bered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;

Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$217,200;

Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$574,400: *Provided*, That local interests will contribute 25 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local cooperation required by the project document;

Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Document Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$225,000;

(8) *Saginaw River, Michigan: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,496,800;*

Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;

(9) *Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 486, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000;*

Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$174,000;

1 Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New
2 York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Con-
3 gress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

4 Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New
5 York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Con-
6 gress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;

7 Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Num-
8 bered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
9 \$2,459,000;

10 Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California:
11 House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress,
12 at an estimated cost of \$896,500: *Provided*, That the Secre-
13 tary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local
14 interests for such work as they may have done upon this
15 project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests
16 insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-
17 neers and found to have been done in accordance with the
18 project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such re-
19 imbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable
20 thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take pre-
21 cedence over other pending projects of higher priority for
22 harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such
23 payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

24 Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California:
25 House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress:

1 *Provided, That Federal participation in the provision of*
2 *entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and cen-*
3 *tral basin recommended in the project report and presently*
4 *estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum*
5 *of the cost thereof;*

6 Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered
7 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
8 \$5,437,000;

9 **(10)***Richmond Harbor, California: House Document Num-*
10 *bered 395, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of*
11 *\$2,086,000;*

12 Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate
13 Document Numbered 83, Eight-third Congress, at an esti-
14 mated cost of \$3,758,700;

15 Umpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reeds-
16 port, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-
17 first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

18 **(11)***Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document*
19 *Numbered 128, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost*
20 *of \$1,500,000;*

21 Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington:
22 House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at
23 an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

24 Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the

1 head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-
2 third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

3 Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washing-
4 ton: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Con-
5 gress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

6 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House
7 Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
8 mated cost of \$421,800;

9 Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Break-
10 water), Washington: ~~(12) House Document Numbered —,~~
11 ~~Eighty-third Congress~~ *In accordance with the report of*
12 *the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954,* at an
13 estimated cost of \$323,700;

14 Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Num-
15 bered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
16 \$179,300;

17 Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered
18 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
19 \$139,250;

20 Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document
21 Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
22 cost of \$1,366,650;

23 Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Num-
24 bered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
25 \$436,000;

1 Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document
2 Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
3 of \$3,397,300;

4 (13) *Tacoma Harbor, Washington: Modification of existing*
5 *project to provide for thirty-foot channel in Port Industrial*
6 *(Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in*
7 *the Office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of*
8 *\$634,200;*

9 Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document
10 Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
11 of \$477,900;

12 Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington:
13 House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at
14 an estimated cost of \$395,500;

15 Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Num-
16 bered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
17 \$425,550;

18 (14) *Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
19 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500;*

20 (15) *Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
21 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800;*

22 (16) *Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414,*
23 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400;*

24 (17) *Petersburg Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the*

1 *report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at*
2 *an estimated cost of \$40,000;*

3 **(18)***Pelican Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the re-*
4 *port of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an*
5 *estimated cost of \$270,000;*

6 **(19)***Ketchikan Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the re-*
7 *port of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an*
8 *estimated cost of \$2,947,900;*

9 **(20)***Rocky Pass in Keku Strait, Alaska: In accordance with*
10 *the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954,*
11 *at an estimated cost of \$214,000;*

12 *Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered*
13 *182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;*

14 *Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered*
15 *182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;*

16 **(21)***Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered*
17 *465, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of*
18 *\$1,685,000;*

19 *Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Docu-*
20 *ment Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated*
21 *cost of \$3,022,000;*

22 **(22)***Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, Territory of Ha-*
23 *waii: House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-third Con-*
24 *gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400;*

BEACH EROSION

Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document
Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
of \$140,000;

Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost
of \$189,000;

Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Num-
bered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of
\$402,900;

Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document
Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated
cost of \$409,000;

South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document
Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
of \$166,550;

Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecti-
cut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress,
at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach;
\$20,400 for Middle Beach;

New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3),
Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third
Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect

1 Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf
2 Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

3 Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut:
4 House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at
5 an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000
6 for Seaside Park;

7 Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
8 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
9 \$2,044,000;

10 Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered
11 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$105,000;

13 Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey:
14 House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at
15 an estimated cost of \$260,000;

16 Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered
17 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

18 Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered
19 380, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

20 Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Num-
21 bered 28, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
22 ~~(23)\$1,176,400~~ \$1,180,400;

23 Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Docu-
24 ment Numbered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
25 cost of \$185,000;

1 Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Num-
2 bered 502, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
3 \$1,275,000 for Edgewater Park; and \$68,900 for White
4 City Park;

5 Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House
6 Document Numbered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an
7 estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

8 Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York:
9 House Document Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at
10 an estimated cost of \$136,500;

11 Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House
12 Document Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
13 mated cost of \$3,874,000;

14 Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document
15 Numbered 349, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
16 of \$65,700 for Seal Beach; and \$91,600 for Surfside;

17 Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Docu-
18 ment Numbered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated
19 cost of \$73,700;

20 Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document
21 Numbered 227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
22 of \$283,700.

23 SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
24 ized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them
25 on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, sub-

1 sequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which
 2 form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work
 3 which may have been done on these projects was approved
 4 by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
 5 projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reim-
 6 bursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable there-
 7 to for funds available therefor and shall not take precedence
 8 over other pending projects of higher priority for improve-
 9 ments.

10 ~~(24)SEC. 103.~~ The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
 11 ized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and
 12 survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from
 13 the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida, in the
 14 vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable pro-
 15 visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950.

16 *SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-*
 17 *ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and*
 18 *surveys to be made at the following-named localities, and*
 19 *subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River*
 20 *and Harbor Act of 1950:*

21 *Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland,*
 22 *Maine;*

23 *Southwest Harbor, Maine;*

24 *Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine;*

25 *Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Chocta-*

1 *watchee Bay, Florida, in the vicinity of Point Wash-*
2 *ington;*

3 *Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Florida, to*
4 *determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective*
5 *measures with respect thereto; and*

6 *Chipola River, Florida, for measures to maintain*
7 *satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes;*

8 *Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks in*
9 *Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.*

10 SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to
11 the city of Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their
12 successors and assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend
13 Channel, in the county of Mobile, Alabama, by the construc-
14 tion and operation of an earth-filled causeway across said
15 channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of Alabama:
16 *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be com-
17 menced until the plans and location therefor have been filed
18 with and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States
19 Army, and by the Secretary of the Army. This provision
20 shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the
21 causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years
22 and completed within five years from the date of this Act and
23 the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby
24 expressly reserved.

25 (25) SEC. 105. *The authorization of the improvement of the*

1 *Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the*
2 *Anclote River (House Document Numbered 371, Seventy-*
3 *fifth Congress) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of*
4 *1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and*
5 *the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as*
6 *to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and*
7 *Lemon Bay, Florida, area, as designated in plans of the*
8 *Corps of Engineers.*

9 *The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Con-*
10 *gress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part*
11 *of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of*
12 *local contribution in the light of the changed condition.*
13 *Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommenda-*
14 *tions shall become effective when approved by the Public*
15 *Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Repre-*
16 *sentatives.*

17 **(26)***SEC. 106. That the requirement, that local interests pro-*
18 *vide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across*
19 *the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and*
20 *harbor project authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935*
21 *(49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Mississippi, below*
22 *Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: Provided, That local*
23 *interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of*
24 *the Army that they will hold and save the United States free*

1 *from any claim for damage which might result from depriva-*
2 *tion of access to the area.*

3 SEC. ~~(27)~~105 107. Title I may be cited as the “River
4 and Harbor Act of 1954”.

5 TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

6 SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22,
7 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
8 amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938
9 (Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall
10 apply to all works authorized in this title except that for
11 any channel improvement or channel rectification project,
12 provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of
13 June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise
14 provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any
15 flood-control project herein adopted requiring local coopera-
16 tion shall expire five years from the date on which local
17 interests are notified in writing by the Department of the
18 Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said
19 interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory
20 to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation
21 will be furnished.

22 SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of
23 December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-
24 eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to

1 projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein
2 set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works
3 of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irriga-
4 tion and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein
5 set forth in full.

6 It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress
7 that the following provisions shall be observed:

8 No project or any modification not authorized, of a proj-
9 ect for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized
10 by the Congress unless a report for such project or modifica-
11 tion has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers,
12 United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

13 SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the
14 benefit of navigation and the control of destructive flood-
15 waters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized
16 to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the
17 Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in ac-
18 cordance with the plans in the respective reports herein-
19 after designated and subject to the conditions set forth
20 therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications,
21 and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project
22 authorized in this title with funds from appropriations here-
23 tofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready
24 for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided*
25 *further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated

1 as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be con-
2 sistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further,*
3 That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible
4 future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall
5 be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construc-
6 tion by the Department of the Army when approved by
7 the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the
8 Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

9 CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

10 That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecti-
11 cut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936
12 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as
13 amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide
14 for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of
15 the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers,
16 of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene,
17 New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs here-
18 tofore authorized.

19 That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecti-
20 cut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three
21 reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend
22 sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in
23 section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December
24 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to

1 by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers,
2 and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in
3 June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the
4 eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control
5 Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

6 SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

7 The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity
8 of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby
9 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
10 tions of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-
11 bered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
12 \$4,469,000.

13 (28) *The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of*
14 *the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania and New York, is*
15 *hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recom-*
16 *mendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated*
17 *June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appro-*
18 *priated the sum of \$25,000,000 for partial accomplishment*
19 *of that plan.*

20 CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

21 The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood
22 control and other purposes in central and southern Florida
23 given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as
24 amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the
25 entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended

1 by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered
2 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof
3 as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the dis-
4 cretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Pro-*
5 *vided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the author-
6 ized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control
7 Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all
8 work over and beyond that previous authorization such
9 conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they
10 shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress,
11 based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest
12 practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the
13 Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*,
14 That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established
15 by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be
16 retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan author-
17 ized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment
18 of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided*
19 *further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is
20 hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000
21 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

22 LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

23 The project for flood control and improvement of the
24 lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15,
25 1928, as amended and modified, is hereby further modified

1 and expanded to include the following items of work and the
2 authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

3 (a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock
4 for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of
5 the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated Febru-
6 ary 2, 1954, ~~(29) as concurred in by~~ and the report of the
7 Chief of Engineers ~~(30) dated April 8, 1954 in House docu-~~
8 *ment Numbered 478, Eighty-third Congress*, with such modi-
9 fications as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find
10 advisable at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navi-
11 gation lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000
12 increase in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under
13 the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the
14 Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which
15 \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this
16 paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire
17 such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be
18 necessary for construction of the project except that local
19 interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the
20 Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended,
21 with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main
22 line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Pro-*
23 *vided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by
24 the United States in connection with this item: *And pro-*
25 *vided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the

1 required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engi-
 2 neers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds
 3 herein authorized to be appropriated.

4 (b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Missis-
 5 sippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City,
 6 Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the
 7 Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53,
 8 Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of
 9 \$440,000.

10 (c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicks-
 11 burg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report
 12 of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85,
 13 Eighty-third Congress.

14 (d) Modification of the authorized project for the New
 15 Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the rec-
 16 ommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document
 17 Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost
 18 of \$1,743,000.

19 (31)(e) *The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake Area,*
 20 *Tennessee and Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the*
 21 *recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated*
 22 *June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100.*

23 (32) TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

24 *The project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland*
 25 *Creek, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance*

1 *with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report*
2 *dated May 28, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,969,000.*

3 The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide
4 flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as author-
5 ized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939,
6 and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in ac-
7 cordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
8 neers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third
9 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

10 BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

11 The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the
12 Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek,
13 Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
14 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
15 Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there
16 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,-
17 000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

18 **(33)***The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Texas,*
19 *authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby mod-*
20 *ified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of*
21 *twelve thousand acre-feet of conservation storage to be used*
22 *as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and*
23 *adjacent military installations.*

1 GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

2 The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and
3 San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substan-
4 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
5 Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third
6 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

7 GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

8 The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas,
9 authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act author-
10 izing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain
11 public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes",
12 approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such au-
13 thorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and
14 Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction,
15 operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secre-
16 tary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers
17 of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the
18 provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir
19 shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approx-
20 imately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which
21 three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for
22 flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood con-
23 trol, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for

1 sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of develop-
2 ment of electric power, at an estimated total cost of
3 \$13,300,000.

4 The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Fed-
5 eral Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate
6 to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation,
7 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may
8 appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-
9 flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such
10 allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable
11 costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net
12 increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage
13 capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and
14 Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation.
15 No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for
16 development of electric power shall be made under this sec-
17 tion unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such in-
18 stallation will actually be constructed.

19 The costs allocated to local interests under this section
20 shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by
21 them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act.
22 The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engi-
23 neers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon
24 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the
25 appropriation available for maintenance and operation of

1 such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such
2 operation and maintenance ; the \$1,400,000 to be con-
3 tributed during the construction period shall be deposited to
4 the credit of the appropriation available for construction of
5 the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that pur-
6 pose ; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief
7 of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon
8 Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of
9 the United States.

10 Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon
11 Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by
12 the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance
13 with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accord-
14 ance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, opera-
15 tion, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local
16 interests and with such power to be made available to such
17 local interests.

18 Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward
19 the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir,
20 \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and at such time
21 or times during the period of such construction, as the
22 Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the
23 contributions allocated to local interests ~~(34) under section~~
24 ~~2~~ with interest thereon at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per centum per

1 annum, shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers
2 over a period not in excess of fifty years.

3 The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement
4 with local interests providing for the payments heretofore
5 described and for all other matters relating to the operation
6 and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which
7 require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement
8 may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water
9 conservation and stream-flow regulation for development
10 of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide
11 that the utilization of water for power development shall not
12 be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimenta-
13 tion purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

14 (35) PECOS RIVER BASIN

15 *The project for flood protection on the Pecos River,*
16 *Texas and New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in*
17 *accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engi-*
18 *neers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at*
19 *an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: Provided, That no appro-*
20 *priations shall be made for construction of Los Esteros*
21 *Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by*
22 *the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage*
23 *from the Alamagordo Reservoir.*

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized sub-

1 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
 2 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185,
 3 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

4 (36)*The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River,*
 5 *Conway County Drainage and Levee District Numbered 1,*
 6 *Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance*
 7 *with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House*
 8 *Document Numbered 167, Eighty-second Congress, at an*
 9 *estimated cost of \$230,600.*

10 (37)*The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River,*
 11 *Holla Bend Bottom, Arkansas, is hereby authorized sub-*
 12 *stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the*
 13 *Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157,*
 14 *Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$312,000.*

15 UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

16 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River
 17 in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized sub-
 18 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
 19 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397,
 20 Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of
 21 \$2,500,000.

22 (38)*The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Han-*
 23 *nibal, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-*
 24 *ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers*

1 *in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-third Congress,*
2 *at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000.*

3 The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River,
4 Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby au-
5 thorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
6 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
7 Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the
8 improvements recommended for Credit Island and for Hen-
9 derson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost
10 for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

11 The project for flood protection on the Missis-
12 sippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8,
13 Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially
14 in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
15 Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third
16 Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

17 The project on the Mississippi River for local flood
18 protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illi-
19 nois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
20 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
21 Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-
22 mated cost of \$7,046,300.

23 The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa

1 River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance
2 with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House
3 Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an
4 estimated cost of \$979,600.

5 MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

6 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
7 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for
8 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri
9 River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers,
10 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and
11 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

12 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
13 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
14 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the
15 project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tribu-
16 taries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in
17 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
18 neers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Con-
19 gress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and
20 there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition
21 to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

22 The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin,
23 approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and
24 supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the

1 project for flood protection on the Osage River and tribu-
2 taries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with
3 the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House
4 Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

5 The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June
6 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys,
7 Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood
8 Control Act of December 22, 1944, is hereby further modi-
9 fied to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute
10 not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of
11 flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the
12 lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Pro-*
13 *vided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal
14 Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of
15 the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor
16 shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project
17 reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-
18 of-way, and public relocations which local interests would
19 have been required to bear had the approved Government
20 plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total
21 amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the
22 work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

23 The project for flood protection on the Chariton River,
24 Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in

1 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
2 neers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Con-
3 gress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

4 **(39)***The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River*
5 *and tributaries at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, is hereby*
6 *authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-*
7 *tions of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in*
8 *its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of*
9 *\$3,430,000.*

10 The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux
11 River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is
12 hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accord-
13 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers,
14 in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress,
15 at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000.

16 **(40)***The general comprehensive plans for flood control and*
17 *other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House*
18 *Document Numbered 475 and Senate Document Numbered*
19 *191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document Num-*
20 *bered 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved*
21 *in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby*
22 *modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers*
23 *for construction or provision of adequate water supply and*
24 *sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pol-*
25 *lock, South Dakota, at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which*

1 *is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities*
2 *in the town which are located within areas which have been*
3 *or will be acquired by the United States because of the*
4 *construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the*
5 *basin.*

6 The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri
7 River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby
8 authorized substantially in accordance with the recommenda-
9 tions of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Num-
10 bered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of
11 \$212,300.

12 (41) *The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart*
13 *River in the vicinity of Mandan, North Dakota, authorized by*
14 *the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Con-*
15 *trol Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accord-*
16 *ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers*
17 *in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost*
18 *of \$1,727,000.*

19 COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

20 The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and
21 tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in
22 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
23 neers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second
24 Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$570,000.

The project for flood control and related purposes on the Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in (42)House Document Numbered , Eighty-third Congress *his report dated June 23, 1954*, at an estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in that document, local interests shall comply with the provisions of local cooperation contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also construct and maintain local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally as outlined in (43)House Document Numbered , Eighty-third Congress *said document*.

KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98,

1 Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550:
 2 *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will
 3 be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the
 4 Army contained in the aforesaid document.

5 LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

6 The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet
 7 River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substan-
 8 tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of
 9 Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-
 10 second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

11 LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

12 In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby
 13 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for
 14 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los An-
 15 geles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California,
 16 approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and
 17 supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

18 (44) SANTA MARIA RIVER BASIN

19 *The project for flood protection on Santa Maria River*
 20 *and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially*
 21 *in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of*
 22 *Engineers in House Document Numbered 400, Eighty-third*
 23 *Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,182,000 for levees and*
 24 *channel improvements to be prosecuted under the direction*

1 *of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief*
2 *of Engineers.*

3 (45)SAN LORENZO RIVER BASIN

4 *The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo River,*
5 *California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance*
6 *with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House*
7 *Document Numbered 447, Eighty-third Congress, at an esti-*
8 *mated cost of \$2,665,000.*

9 SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

10 The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, Cali-
11 fornia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with
12 the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, in House
13 Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an esti-
14 mated cost of \$1,110,000.

15 The plan of improvement for flood control on the Ameri-
16 can River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in
17 accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engi-
18 neers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Con-
19 gress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

20 LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

21 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
22 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for
23 the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower
24 San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of

1 December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by sub-
2 sequent Acts of Congress.

3 (46) SAN LORENZO CREEK BASIN

4 *The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo Creek,*
5 *Alameda County, California, is hereby authorized substan-*
6 *tially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of*
7 *Engineers in House Document Numbered 452, Eighty-third*
8 *Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,790,000.*

9 (47) TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

10 *The project for flood protection on Truckee River and*
11 *tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized sub-*
12 *stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief*
13 *of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an esti-*
14 *mated cost of \$791,000: Provided, That the authorization for*
15 *improvement for flood control on Truckee River, California*
16 *and Nevada, contained herein shall not become effective unless*
17 *and until the "Washoe Reclamation Project" on the Truckee*
18 *and Carson Rivers, California and Nevada, shall have been*
19 *authorized pursuant to law.*

20 COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

21 In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby
22 authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for
23 the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia
24 River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was author-

1 ized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and
 2 these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power
 3 development in the following projects in tributary basins, sub-
 4 stantially in accordance with the recommendations of the
 5 Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531,
 6 Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of
 7 McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on
 8 Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White
 9 Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam
 10 River, Oregon.

11 (48) *The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at*
 12 *Eugene and vicinity, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Con-*
 13 *trol Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of*
 14 *1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with*
 15 *the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 131,*
 16 *Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$893,600.*

17 TERRITORY OF ALASKA

18 The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tribu-
 19 taries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accord-
 20 ance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in
 21 House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress,
 22 at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

23 TERRITORY OF HAWAII

24 The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream
 25 and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii,

1 is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the rec-
2 ommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document
3 Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost
4 of \$347,000.

5 SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby author-
6 ized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and sur-
7 veys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel
8 and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by
9 or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction
10 of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United
11 States and its Territorial possessions, which include the fol-
12 lowing-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or
13 formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or
14 work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no
15 supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made
16 unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the
17 Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to
18 be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such
19 review is required by the national defense or by changed
20 physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the
21 Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any
22 project for the improvement of any waterway or (49)harbor
23 stream mentioned in this (50)title section until the project
24 for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:
25 Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

1 Neponset River, Massachusetts.

2 (51) *Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Con-*
3 *necticut.*

4 Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Penn-
5 sylvania in the interest of flood control.

6 Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

7 (52) *Devils River and tributaries, Texas.*

8 (53) *Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico.*

9 Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

10 Coos Bay, Oregon.

11 SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the
12 sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated
13 for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the
14 prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be
15 carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of
16 December 22, 1944, as amended.

17 SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August
18 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Con-
19 gress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July
20 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress),
21 as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953
22 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby
23 still further amended to read as follows:

24 “That 75 per centum of all moneys received and de-
25 posited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal

1 year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the
2 United States for flood control, navigation, and allied pur-
3 poses, including the development of hydroelectric power,
4 shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the
5 Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to
6 be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the
7 benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or
8 counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying
9 any of the expenses of county government in such county
10 or counties, including public obligations of levee and drain-
11 age districts for flood control and drainage improvements:
12 *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than
13 one State or county, the distributive share to each from the
14 proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area
15 therein.”

16 SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act ap-
17 proved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

18 “That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as
19 required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter
20 made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related pur-
21 poses by the United States, for the establishment, operation,
22 and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of
23 recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as
24 the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the
25 Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau

1 such service is advisable in connection with either preliminary
2 examinations and surveys or works of improvement author-
3 ized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and
4 related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the
5 recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to
6 allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure."

7 SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of
8 August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood
9 Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended
10 to read as follows:

11 "That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to
12 allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations here-
13 tofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood
14 control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris,
15 and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable
16 streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the
17 Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of
18 flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall
19 be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from
20 the appropriations for any one fiscal year."

21 SEC. 209. That section 4 of the Act approved July
22 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress),
23 is amended to read as follows:

1 “The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the
2 Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain,
3 and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir
4 areas under the control of the Department of the Army,
5 and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation
6 of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also author-
7 ized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities
8 thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such
9 terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in
10 the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organ-
11 izations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at
12 reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the pub-
13 lic service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises:
14 *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal,
15 State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases
16 where appropriate, may be granted without monetary con-
17 siderations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion
18 of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secre-
19 tary of the Army determines such action to be in the public
20 interest, and for such periods of time and upon such con-
21 ditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That
22 in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local
23 governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for

1 the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests,
2 or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be
3 authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be neces-
4 sary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize
5 the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the develop-
6 ment, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such
7 lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid
8 to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary
9 of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas
10 of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally,
11 without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and
12 other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit
13 from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs
14 shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is
15 determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary
16 to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations
17 as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use
18 of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted
19 which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish
20 and game of the State in which such area is situated. All
21 moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges
22 shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as
23 miscellaneous receipts."

1 SEC. 210. Title II may be cited as the “Flood Control
2 Act of 1954”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1954.

Attest: LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments August 17 (legislative day, August 5), 1954.

Attest: J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary.

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 17 (legislative day, AUGUST 5), 1954

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

SENATE

11. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed, 77 to 2, with amendments H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood control bill, which authorizes \$20,000,000 additional to this Department for work on watersheds. Senate conferees were appointed. (pp. 14118-37.)
12. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9924 (see item 4 above) (pp. 14076, 14138-9).
13. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2263, the fringe-benefits personnel bill (p. 14138).
Passed with amendments H. R. 9709, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, which includes a provision extending it to approximately 2.5 million Federal employees (pp. 14144-7).
Passed with amendment H. R. 9909, to prohibit payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses (pp. 14148-52).
Agreed to a Williams amendment extending from 3 to 5 years the statute of limitations on certain crimes (pp. 14149-52).
Sen. Knowland submitted amendments he intends to propose to H. R. 7774, to establish a uniform system of granting incentive awards to Federal employees (p. 14076).
14. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. The amendment by Sen. Holland (see Digest 157) to H. R. 9756, to increase the borrowing power of CCC from \$8.5 billion to \$10 billion, would include mangoes in the provision which would prohibit imports of certain commodities that do not comply with USDA marketing orders. The amendment also would make this provision effective upon the enactment of H. R. 9756 or the Agricultural Act of 1954, whichever occurs later.
15. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State (p. 14170).
16. INVESTIGATIONS; PERSONNEL. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2308, to give the Attorney General concurrent jurisdiction over investigation of violations of title 18 of the U. S. Code (regarding crimes) by Government officers and employees, except for members of the armed forces and the Post Office Department (p. 14139). This bill will now be sent to the President.
17. CONVENING OF CONGRESS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 585, to provide that the 84th Congress shall convene at noon on Wed., Jan. 5, 1955 (p. 14097). This measure will now be sent to the President.
18. COMPTROLLER GENERAL. Passed without amendment S. 3868, to authorize the payment of salary to any individual given recess appointment as Comptroller General of the U. S. before the beginning of the 84th Cong. (pp. 14080-1).
19. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. H. R. 9756, increasing the borrowing power of CCC from \$8.5 billion to \$10 billion, was made the unfinished business (p. 14152). The "Daily Digest" states that there will be a call of the calendar and consideration of various conference reports during Wed. (p. D996).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Hunter inserted his summary of the accomplishments of this Congress and the administration in the field of agriculture and related

matters (pp. A6081-6).

Sen. Beall inserted a Baltimore Sun editorial, "An Investment Pays Off," commending the President for the progress of his legislative program and stating that his program, "designed to bring more resiliency into the whole structure of farm supports, was argued before the true farmers of the country as if he and Secretary Benson had never heard of the political farmers" (p. A6098).

Sen. Thye inserted a St. Paul Pioneer Press article, "Benson Strategy," discussing passage of the farm bill and stating that "the result is being widely hailed as a personal triumph for Secretary Benson" (p. A6099).

21. **MARKETING.** Rep. Church inserted a Federal Reserve Bank (Chicago) agricultural letter discussing rising marketing costs and the share of the farmers and the middlemen (pp. A6087-8).

Rep. Hill inserted his recent address before the Annual Convention of the Independent Grocers Alliance discussing the problems of marketing, food distribution, and "the battle against waste of fruit and vegetables" (pp. A6092-3).

22. **TAXATION.** Extension of remarks of Reps. Knox and Berry giving some of the highlights of the new tax law (pp. A6088-90, A6129-30).

23. **DROUGHT RELIEF.** Extension of remarks of Rep. Moulder criticizing the administration of the drought relief program and inserting a Daily Democrat-Leader (Fayette, Mo.) article stating that "we say it is a rotten deal and not worth the price of the airplane tickets Washington spent to send men out here to decide which class of farmer they would try to help" (p. A6101).

Rep. Hill inserted a statement explaining assistance available under the drought-relief program (pp. A6118-9).

24. **FOREIGN TRADE.** Rep. Bailey inserted O. R. Strackbein's (chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import Policy) statement discussing to what "extent imports may be injurious, a matter of indifference or even helpful" (pp. A6106-8).

25. **FARM LABOR.** Rep. Rooney inserted a Nat'l Catholic Weekly Review America commenting on the Mexican "wetback" problem (p. A6109).

26. **PRICE SUPPORTS.** Sen. Thye inserted a Washington Post and Times Herald editorial and his letter in response to the editorial which he said "clearly and unmistakably" impugn the motives of those Members of the Senate who opposed changing the level of farm price supports (pp. A6119-20).

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. **PERSONNEL; HOLIDAYS.** S. Con. Res. 105, by Sen. Johnston (introduced Aug. 13), to excuse Government employees from work on the afternoon of Aug. 31, 1954, to attend the parade of The American Legion in D. C.; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

28. **FARM LOANS.** S. 3877, by Sen. Gillette, to accelerate establishment of comprehensive soil- and water-conserving works on private and public property through provision of appropriate credit for conservation, reforestation, and water-control work; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 14075).: Remarks of author (pp. 14075-6).

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, of course, I fully recognize the fact that in time of real emergency the Nation must have the power to protect itself. I yield to no one in my desire to grant adequate powers to our Government to protect the Nation.

It seems to me, however, that the so-called antislavery bills which we have been passing during the past few days go very far afield, and do not protect the Nation but threaten the civil liberties of our people and the rights of labor.

As my colleagues know, earlier today I voted for the bill which had been introduced originally by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], placing very heavy sanctions against those who belong to the Communist Party or who believe in the principles of the Communist Party, or who act in accordance with the orders of the Communist Party. I was glad to do so, because I believe firmly that the Communist Party is not a political party, but is a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence at such time as suits its purpose. I believe it is a very real threat.

However, in our desire to control the activities of members of the Communist Party, I believe we are going a long way on the road toward abridging the civil liberties of our people. I read a part of the explanation of the pending bill as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit active sabotage, espionage, or other subversion.

The facilities involved are privately owned and are primarily engaged in what is regarded as normal civilian production. Although there is authority for barring subversive individuals from facilities directly engaged in the performance of defense contracts, there is no similar authority with respect to these facilities, although, as in the case of a power plant or a producer of other basic materials or supplies required by a defense contractor, sabotage or interruption of production by these facilities could very materially curtail defense production.

Mr. President, I would have no objection to giving wide powers to the President in case of war and in the case of plants engaged in the production of genuine defense materiel—in other words, what we know as real defense plants. However, the bill goes far beyond that. The bill does not deal with defense plants alone. We are dealing with all plants. We are dealing with privately owned facilities which are primarily engaged in what is regarded as normal civilian production.

There is absolutely no limit to what could be done in connection with the operation of such plants and in connection with the employment or discharge of employees of plants which are privately owned and privately operated, and not used for defense purposes at all. There is nothing to stop the Government from going into a pants factory, a civilian automobile factory, a washing machine factory, a refrigerator plant, a television plant, an ice cream plant, or any other kind of plant, and saying: "We are not going to allow particular people to come into the plant or to work in the plant."

The Government could bar them from employment, and exclude them from the operations of the plant and from their means of a livelihood.

I have lived a long time, and I have seen many things happen, Mr. President. I am acquainted with the efforts that have frequently been made by industry to break strikes and to control the activities of organized labor or of labor generally. I believe this bill, just as the so-called Butler bill, which I voted against and spoke against, poses serious threat to the freedom of action that should be the right of legitimate, decent labor in this country.

Under this bill anybody could be excluded from a plant, even plants engaged in civilian production. I am amazed at the boldness of the bill and the frankness of the report, because in describing what the bill does, it says:

The facilities involved are privately owned and are primarily engaged in what is regarded as normal civilian production.

Why should anybody have the right to say who can or cannot work in such plants, unless there is proof that those excluded are guilty of disloyalty or treason or attempts at espionage?

Mr. President, I think we are departing a long way from the principles which we have followed for so many decades, of protecting the rights of labor to organize and to work without unnecessary governmental interference.

We established the National Labor Relations Board and we have established many other boards for the protection of labor, so as to assure that justice is done to labor, to employer, and to the consumer, because, after all, if we do not do justice to labor, we are not doing justice to industry or to the consumer since I believe their interests are usually closely related.

In this bill we say very frankly that at any time the President feels there may be some emergency—and there is no binding description of what constitutes an emergency—he may say to John Smith or Jim Brown, or to 10,000 John Smiths or 10,000 Jim Browns, "You cannot work here. We do not want you. There is a strike on which we believe is subversive. We believe that strike may possibly be antagonistic to the interests of this country." Therefore, they are excluded from the plant.

I cannot conceive of any better device to break a strike than that which is afforded by this bill. I think it is a highly dangerous bill. I think it is a bill which should be defeated overwhelmingly in the Congress, but I am frank to say I do not believe it will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have 3 minutes more, please?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not believe the bill will be defeated, because I know the temper of the Senate at this time. We are off on a rampage by indirect means to give the Attorney General of the United States, and the Subversive Activities Control Board, the right to con-

trol labor. I am not accusing the present Attorney General of unfair tactics or of any mean motives, but I am convinced that in the past few days, in connection with these so-called antislavery bills, which are not antislavery bills at all but are antilabor bills, we are seriously interfering with the rights of labor, the dignity of labor, and the ability of labor to fight for its rights and its liberties. We are passing a number of bills which put chains around the necks of the workers, chains they cannot break. We are putting ourselves in the hands of a few officials of the Government who will be able to dictate the policies of labor and the policies of the country.

I am not a laboring man. I do not make my living by the sweat of my brow or with my hands. But I believe that organized labor is of the utmost importance to all of the people of this country, and it is of the utmost importance that justice be done to labor, and unless we protect the rights of organized labor, we shall harm not only labor, but the entire Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back all their remaining time?

Mr. KENNEDY. We yield back our time, and ask unanimous consent that each side may keep 5 minutes at the end of the quorum call.

Mr. FERGUSON. Each side reserves 5 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes to each side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We shall reserve 10 minutes for each side and yield back the balance of the time. I suggest the absence of a quorum, not to come out of the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement is that each side have 10 minutes after the quorum call, that the time consumed in making the quorum call not be taken out of the time of either side, and that the remaining time is yielded back. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not know whether it will be possible to have a yea-and-nay vote on the bill. I believe the bill is a bad, dangerous bill—dangerous not only to labor, but to all the people of the country. If there is not to be a yea-and-nay vote, I desire, nevertheless, to be recorded in the negative on the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

This is not an antilabor bill. It does not apply solely to workers. It applies to management as well, because the bill contains a provision that if management were barred from a plant illegally or wrongfully, it could recover damages because of inability to use the plant.

Only two kinds of persons would be in a plant—management and labor. The bill is not an antilabor bill. It is designed to protect America from sabotage and espionage. In the present cold war, with conditions as they are, America must be placed in a position to defend herself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may be mistaken, but I do not think I am. I have not found anything in the bill which includes management in its scope.

Mr. FERGUSON. It includes any person in a plant.

Mr. LEHMAN. Any worker in a plant.

Mr. FERGUSON. A member of management is a worker.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a half a minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the point of view expressed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I think this is an exceedingly bad bill. I think it could be used very arbitrarily, to the great injury of American free labor. Instead of calling it an espionage and sabotage bill, it would be better to call it a police state bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1954."

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The history of modern warfare has established that the defense of any country is greatly dependent upon the effective and continued operation of its industrial economy and the full utilization of its productive capabilities. In time of war or of preparation for defense from attack by a potential aggressor, injury to the industrial economy or impairment of the productive capabilities of a country may severely curtail its military effectiveness, and such injury or impairment has become a major objective of aggressor nations in their preparation for and prosecution of war.

(2) There exists in the United States a limited number of individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage of the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, espionage, or other subversive acts in order to weaken the power and ability of the United States to cope with actual or threatened war, invasion, insurrection, subversive activity, disturbance, or threatened disturbance of international relations.

(3) In such circumstances it is essential that, without impairing the rights or privileges of the great bulk of loyal United States citizens, such individuals be barred from access to facilities injury to which would be harmful to the industrial economy and productive capabilities of the United States, and, therefore, to its military effectiveness.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President finds by proclamation or Executive order that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbance or threatened disturbance of the international relations of the United States, the President is authorized to institute such measures and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to bar from access to any defense facility or facilities individuals as to whom there is reasonable ground to believe they may engage in sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts. The President may perform any function vested in him by this act through or with the aid of such officers or agencies as he may designate.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no measure instituted, or rule or regulation issued, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall operate to deprive any individual of access to any defense facility or facilities unless such individual shall first have been notified of the charges against him and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against the charges. Such charges shall be sufficiently specific to permit the individual to respond to them, and such opportunity shall, if the individual so desires, include a hearing. The Administrative Procedure Act shall not be applicable to proceedings under this act. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to require any investigatory organization of the United States Government to disclose its informants or other information which in its judgment would endanger its investigatory activity: *Provided, however, That in the event that such information is not disclosed the individual charged shall be furnished with a fair summary of the information in support of the charges against him.*

(c) The measures instituted, or rules or regulations issued, pursuant to subsection (a) hereof may operate to bar summarily any individual from access to any defense facility or facilities provided that such individual shall be notified in writing of the charges against him within 15 days from the time he is so barred and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against such charges, including, if he so requests, a hearing within 30 days of the date of such request. Reasonable continuances may, however, be permitted if consistent with expeditious disposition of the matter. A determination shall be made and transmitted to the individual affected within 30 days from the date of the termination of the hearing or, if no hearing is requested, of the submission of the individual's defense to the charges, and if administrative proceedings are provided by the rules or regulations for review of any such determination they shall be promptly determined. In the event that the summary bar against such individual is removed as a result of any proceeding, the individual shall be compensated by the United States solely for his loss of earnings in or in connection with any defense facility during the period he was so barred.

(d) As used in this act the term "defense facility" shall have the same meaning as it has in title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, but shall not include vessels, piers, or waterfront facilities.

SEC. 4. Whoever willfully violates any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to the provisions of this act, or knowingly obstructs or interferes with the exercise of any power conferred by this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more

than \$10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any individual of any rights or benefits conferred upon him by the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9580) to revise and extend the laws relating to espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8647) to amend Revised Statutes 4426.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1954

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2026, H. R. 9859, the omnibus public-works bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which has been formulated after consultation with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who is in charge of the bill. I have consulted with the majority leader and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle. I submit the proposed unanimous-consent agreement on behalf of the majority leader and myself, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of Calendar No. 2026, H. R. 9859, an act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, debate on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], in the event he is opposed to any such amendment or motion; otherwise, by the mover and the minority leader: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received: *And provided further*, That debate upon the bill itself shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, with the understanding that as we go through the bill they can be amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if that is agreeable.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that agreeable to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, that is agreeable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is it my understanding that the bill will be regarded as a clean bill, so that amendments may be made as if the bill were being considered anew?

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. That is my purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is asking unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, but amendments may be offered from the floor. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, after line 9, to insert:
"Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document No. 358, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$91,389,000."

At the top of page 7, to insert:

"The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 87, 81st Congress, is hereby further modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engi-

neers and found to have been done in accordance with the project modification adopted in said act, provided that such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$65,000."

After line 13, to insert:

"Charleston Harbor, S. C.: Senate Document No. 136, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$200,000."

On page 8, after line 2, to insert:

"Carabelle Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 451, 83d Congress (maintenance of existing channel)."

After line 20, to insert:

Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.: Modification of existing project in accordance with plans on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000."

On page 9, after line 19, to insert:

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 24, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$180,000."

On page 11, after line 16, to insert:

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 29, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000."

On page 13, after line 5, to insert:

"Richmond Harbor, Calif.: House Document No. 395, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,086,000."

After line 14, to insert:

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 128, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,500,000."

On page 14, line 7, after the name "Washington", to strike out "House Document No. 83d Congress" and insert "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954"

At the top of page 15, to insert:

"Tacoma Harbor, Wash.: Modification of existing project to provide for 30-foot channel in Port Industrial (Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$634,200."

After line 14, to insert:

"Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500."

After line 16, to insert:

"Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800."

After line 18, to insert:

"Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400."

After line 24, to insert:

"Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 465, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,685,000"

On page 16, after line 5, to insert:

"Navilwili and Port Allen Harbors, T. H.: House Document No. 453, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400."

On page 18, line 7, to strike out "\$1,176,400" and insert "\$1,180,400."

On page 19, after line 20, to strike out:

"Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made to determine the need for a channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington, subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland, Maine;

"Southwest Harbor, Maine;

"Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine;

"Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington;

"Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Fla., to determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective measures with respect thereto; and

"Chipola River, Fla., for measures to maintain satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes."

On page 21, after line 9, to insert:

"Sec. 105. The authorization of the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosatchee River to the Anclote River (H. Doc. No. 371, 75th Cong.) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and Lemon Bay, Fla., area, as designated in plans of the Corps of Engineers.

"The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Congress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of local contribution in the light of the changed condition. Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommendations shall become effective when approved by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

On page 22, after line 2, to insert the following new section:

"Sec. 106. That the requirement, that local interests provide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and harbor project authorized by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: *Provided*, That local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will hold and save the United States free from any claim for damage which might result from deprivation of access to the area."

In line 13, to change the section number from "105" to "107."

On page 25, after line 20, to insert:

"The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa. and N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that plan."

On page 27, line 15, after the numerals "1954", to strike out "as concurred in by" and insert "and"; in line 16, after the word "Engineers", to strike out "dated April 8, 1954" and insert "in House Document No. 478, 83d Congress."

On page 29, after line 2, to insert:

"(e) The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake Area, Tenn. and Ky., is substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100."

After line 22, to insert:

"The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby modified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of 12,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations."

On page 32, line 25, after the word "interests", to strike out "under section 2."

On page 33, after line 14, to insert:

"PECOS RIVER BASIN

"The project for flood protection on the Pecos River, Tex., and N. Mex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers

for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: *Provided*, That no appropriations shall be made for construction of Los Esteros Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage from the Alamagordo Reservoir."

On page 35, after line 3, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Conway County Drainage and Levee District No. 1, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 167, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$230,600."

After line 9, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Holla Bend Bottom, Ark., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$312,000."

After line 21, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Hannibal, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000."

At the top of page 39, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$3,430,000."

After line 12, to insert:

"The Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to compensate the owners of water wells in the vicinity of Cold Brook Dam in South Dakota for losses determined by him to have been sustained by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result, wholly or partially, of the construction and operation of Cold Brook Dam: *Provided*, That claims for losses compensable under this section shall be submitted not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, or not later than 2 years after the lowering of the level of water which is the basis for the claim, whichever is the later."

After line 24, to insert:

"The general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, 78th Congress, 2d session, approved in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers for construction or provision of adequate water supply and sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pollock, S. Dak., at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities in the town which are located within areas which have been or will be acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the basin."

On page 40, after line 20, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart River in the vicinity of Mandan, N. Dak., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$1,727,000."

On page 41, line 18, after the word "in", to strike out "House Document No. 83d Congress" and insert "his report dated June 23, 1954."

On page 42, line 2, after the word "in", to strike out "House Document No. 83d Congress" and insert "said document."

At the top of page 43, to insert:

"SANTA MARIA RIVER BASIN

"The project for flood protection on Santa Maria River and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 400, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,182,000 for levees and channel improvements to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers."

After line 9, to insert:

"SAN LORENZO RIVER BASIN

"The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 447, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,665,000."

On page 44, after line 9, to insert:

"SAN LORENZO CREEK BASIN

"The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo Creek, Alameda County, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 452, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,790,000."

After line 15, to insert:

"TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

"The project for flood protection on Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$791,000: *Provided*, That the authorization for improvement for flood control on Truckee River, Calif. and Nev., contained herein shall not become effective unless and until the Washoe reclamation project on the Truckee and Carson Rivers, Calif. and Nev., shall have been authorized pursuant to law."

On page 45, after line 17, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at Eugene and vicinity, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 131, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$893,600."

On page 47, line 6, after the word "or" to strike out "harbor" and insert "stream"; in line 7, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "section"; after line 10, to insert:

"Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Connecticut."

After line 15, to insert:

"Devils River and tributaries, Texas."

After line 16, to insert:

"Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico."

On page 50, line 7, to change the section number from "210" to "209."

On page 52, line 10, to change the section number from "211" to "210."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes in order to make an explanation of the bill.

First, Mr. President, I suggest that the Chair ascertain whether there are any further amendments to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, are we to have an explanation of the bill? Many amendments may be offered after the bill is explained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor. How much time does he yield to himself?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield myself 15 minutes in order that I may explain the bill.

Mr. President, House bill 9859 is an omnibus bill providing authorizations for river and harbor and flood-control projects. It is the first general authorization bill considered by the Congress since the act of May 17, 1950. All of the projects proposed in the bill have been considered in extensive hearings held by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate. The representatives of the Corps of Engineers, which prepared the reports and submitted recommendations on these projects, as requested by the Congress, were heard by both committees. They have furnished full information on the works proposed and the justifications for their accomplishment. Local interests which would be affected by the proposed projects were given full opportunity to present their views either for or against the proposed projects.

I should like to take this opportunity to remind the Senate very briefly of the procedures by which these projects are started and developed. In the first place, examinations and surveys of proposed projects must be specifically authorized by Congress. No survey can be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers without such specific authorization. Survey authorizations are provided by the Congress after receiving requests from the local people who are interested in securing improvements for flood-control or navigation purposes. After local requests are enacted by Congress into authorizations for surveys, the Corps of Engineers then proceeds to carry forward the surveys as rapidly as funds are made available. During the course of the surveys, public hearings are held by the Corps of Engineers in the localities which would be affected by the work under study, and the surveys are coordinated with all public agencies which may have some direct interest in the proposed improvements. After the surveys are completed they are then referred to the governors of the States in which the proposed work is located, and to interested Federal agencies. The comments of the governors and Federal agencies are all submitted to Congress with the report of the Corps of Engineers.

The proposed projects have, therefore, been carefully worked up by the technical staff of the Corps of Engineers, and have been fully scrutinized by local interests, State governors, and Federal agencies.

All members of the Committee on Public Works have taken part in the consideration of this bill, and it is reported to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the committee. The projects included in the bill as passed by the House are described in detail in the House Report No. 2247. The additional projects which were considered by the committee and incorporated in the bill are described in Senate Report No. 2007. A complete list of the projects, both

those originally approved by the House and the ones added by the Senate committee, are shown in lists on pages 5, 19, and 22 of the Senate report. The committee has approved the projects contained in the bill as passed by the House, and we have recommended additional projects which were proposed for consideration subsequent to the close of the House hearings. Most of the projects considered by the Senate committee were found to be fully justified, and are thus recommended for inclusion in the bill.

A few projects were passed over without prejudice for the reason that they had not been processed to the point where adequate data could be made available for the consideration of the committee.

The bill as passed by the House contained a total of 147 projects, with a total estimated cost of \$890 million. The Senate committee recommends the addition of 31 fully justified projects at a total estimated cost of \$169 million. The bill as reported to the Senate, therefore, includes a grand total of 178 projects, at a total estimated cost of \$1,059,000,000.

By comparison with previous authorizations, the total in this bill is smaller than the last 3 bills, which ranged between \$1,290,000,000 and \$1,450,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that the bill is purely an authorization bill. It does not provide any appropriations, and action to carry forward any of the projects proposed in this bill will be subject to the further review by the Appropriations Committees, and action by those committees and by the Congress itself on future appropriation bills.

A rather extensive explanation of the river and harbor flood-control programs is printed in the Senate report. I hope Members of the Senate will have the opportunity to examine the entire report, because I think they will find much valuable information therein with respect to these very important programs.

I should like to mention very briefly one of the more important factors which is considered in passing upon the justification for these projects. That is the ratio of benefits to cost. Under existing law, Congress has laid down the policy of participation in these projects whenever the benefits exceed the cost. The practical way of using these criteria is to convert all the costs of construction and maintenance to an annual basis, and compare the result with the average annual benefits which would accrue from the completed project. Therefore, under existing law if there is \$1 of benefit for each \$1 of cost, the project is considered economically justified within the letter of the law.

The projects in the bill all meet that test, and most of them are well above the minimum requirement. The highest benefit-cost ratio in the bill is for a beach erosion control project, in which the benefits would amount to \$17.9 for each dollar of cost. Many of the projects have better than a 2-to-1 ratio. More than two-thirds of the projects have a ration of 1.5 to 1, or better. Overall, the estimated benefits from all projects in the bill will exceed the cost by a very substantial margin.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to the members of the Committee on Public Works for the splendid cooperation in taking up the bill upon rather short notice, and at a time when our workload is at its peak. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and all other members of the subcommittee, for their excellent and efficient work on the bill.

I also wish to commend the representatives of the Corps of Engineers who assisted the committee, and so ably supplied the technical data needed by the committee in its consideration of these projects. Their cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Mr. President, I also wish to thank the members of the staff for their cooperation and fine, intelligent work in the preparation of the bill.

I think the Committee on Public Works has one of the best records in the Senate for bipartisan action. The unanimous committee approval of the bill is further evidence of that record. The committee also is one of the most representative committees from the standpoint of the areas served by its members. The New England area is very ably represented by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPRON]. From the Middle Atlantic area we have the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and I am happy to be able to share in the representation of that section. The South Atlantic area has one member on the committee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is a most capable representative of that part of our country.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Tennes-

see [Mr. GORE] furnish very competent service for the central southern and lower Mississippi areas. The Great Lakes area is well represented by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE]. The Southwest has two very eminent representatives, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The Great Northern Plains area has but one representative, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], but I know it could not be more effectively served, even if it had several members on the committee. The Pacific Slope area is very efficiently represented in the southern portion by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and in the northern portion by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. This gives us rather complete coverage of the principal geographical regions of the country.

I believe we have a good bill. We are recommending a number of very meritorious public-works projects that will produce much needed benefits. They are all economically justified.

They will form a necessary part of the expanding economy, and they will be available for development, as appropriations are provided and as economic conditions warrant.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a short summary of the projects, showing the number of projects and their total cost.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A breakdown of these projects among the categories of flood control, rivers and harbors, and beach erosion control, is as follows:

	Passed by House		Added by Senate committee		Total	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Rivers and harbors.....	85	\$212, 915, 100	15	\$106, 303, 300	100	\$319, 218, 400
Beach-erosion control.....	22	14, 007, 664	0	0	22	14, 007, 664
Flood control.....	40	663, 352, 750	16	62, 850, 300	56	726, 203, 050
Total.....	147	890, 275, 514	31	169, 153, 600	178	1, 059, 429, 114

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. It is a pleasure for me to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, for presenting his statement on the bill. I know this is one bill which does not have any political implications. All of those of us who serve on the Committee on Public Works, under the leadership of the able chairman, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, have tried to report a bill which will be of service and benefit to the entire country. As the chairman of the committee has stated, the entire area of the Nation is taken care of, not with the idea of having a pork-barrel bill but with the idea of having a beneficial measure.

So I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania. I, for one, who heretofore

had been chairman of the committee, commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for the fine work which has been done by him; and I know that equally efficient and successful work has been done by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the other members of the committee. No politics whatsoever were involved; all members of the committee tried to do a good job.

So I desire to pay a warm and well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate greatly the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. All of us know that he is the senior member of the Committee on Public Works, and he has been most cooperative and helpful.

Mr. President, at this time I offer and send to the desk two perfecting amendments, for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRIPPA in the chair). The amendments submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in lines 20 to 22, it is proposed to strike out "In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 24, 1954," and to insert in lieu thereof "House Document No. 487, 83d Congress."

On page 11, in lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to strike out "In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 29, 1954," and insert in lieu thereof "House Document No. 486, 83d Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. Let me inquire how much time the Senator from Connecticut wishes to have me yield to him.

Mr. BUSH. Will the chairman of the committee be so kind as to yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MARTIN. Certainly, Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, first, I wish to endorse the remarks of my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. I thoroughly agree with all he has said.

I also desire to pay my tribute to him, as the ranking minority member of the committee, for his full cooperation in connection with the preparation of the bill; and I may say the same of all other members of the committee on his side of the aisle. I did not think we could possibly have reported so good a bill as we have, and so carefully prepared a bill, without the very expert help of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], in particular, who have devoted more time than have other members of the committee on that side of the aisle, in connection with the hearings and the preparation of the bill.

I also desire to pay my tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who has given this matter a great deal of careful attention; and because of his wide and extensive experience in these matters, he has guided the bill very carefully to the floor of the Senate.

I think all of us can feel very happy about the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I desire to pay my respects to and extend my congratulations to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]; and also to my friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]; and, indeed, to all the other members of the Committee on Public Works, which held hearings over

a long period of weeks and months, and has produced, today, on the floor of the Senate, a bill which literally will build America and will make America's economy stronger.

Mr. President, let me repeat that I pay my sincere respects and extend my congratulations to them; and I desire to state that I was delighted and thrilled to be able to participate in the discussions in the committee and subcommittee meetings.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his generous remarks.

In view of all the nice things we have said about each other, I hope we shall be able to pass the bill.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a brief statement, if the distinguished chairman of the committee will be so kind as to yield me an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this bill continues a program of development of our rivers and harbors which had its beginning as a Federal Government activity over 125 years ago. Over this span of years, our Nation has grown from a group of small frontier settlements to a position of world leadership in economic development. Our transportation systems have played a vital part in this phenomenal development. Water transportation has always been the mainstay of these systems for the movement of bulk commodities and heavy goods. Over the past 125 years, we have developed almost 300 commercial harbors, 28,000 miles of improved waterways and about 500 locks and dams. These improvements have facilitated the growth of trade with other nations, developed commerce among the States and contributed to the security and continued growth of the Nation.

The latest available figures show that in 1952 the waterborne commerce of the United States totaled about 890 million tons, of which 660 million were domestic and 230 million were foreign. This represents an increase of 50 percent over the pre-war peak in 1929. On the inland waterways, the commerce reached a total of 168 billion ton-miles in 1952, which is an increase of 42 percent since 1940 when the total amounted to 118 billion ton-miles.

The improvement of these waterways for a growing peacetime economy has also given us a valuable asset in time of war. They have been used to provide access to inland shipyards and they have made possible a widespread geographical diffusion of manufacturing processes which otherwise would have been forced into congested or more exposed coastal areas.

The bill provides for many projects to deepen and widen existing channels and harbors. This is necessitated by the increasing use of larger and more economic vessels which will result in lower transportation costs and lower prices to

the consumers. The progressive development of waterborne transportation has consistently brought economies in the cost of production of the many goods that provide us with the highest living standards of any Nation on the earth today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes more to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the bill includes a number of projects for the control of beach erosion. Under the basic law establishing the policy for this program the Federal participation is limited to not to exceed one-third of the total estimated cost of the proposed remedial work. The remaining two-thirds of the total cost must be borne by local interests. The basic law also limits Federal participation to publicly-owned beach areas. No Federal financing is permitted for any privately-owned beaches. The beach erosion control projects included in this bill have been shown by the studies presented to Congress to have a high degree of economic justification.

The bill further continues the Federal flood control program which had its initial beginning in 1879 when interest first developed in the problems of the great Lower Mississippi River Basin. This initial interest was followed by the adoption of a Federal project for flood control on the lower Mississippi, and also on the Sacramento River in California, where another great flood problem had become evident. In 1936 the Congress adopted flood control as a National policy with the declaration that floods constituted a menace to National welfare and that flood control is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States and local interests where the benefits are in excess of the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected. From that beginning there has grown the important flood control program undertaken by the United States.

The flood control program undertaken by the Federal Government has already brought large returns. It is estimated that if no Federal flood control measures had been undertaken the total average flood damages in the United States would be in excess of \$800 million a year. The Federal flood control works now in operation prevent flood losses estimated at more than \$300 million a year, and a considerable amount of flood damage is prevented by works constructed by local interests. The remaining average annual flood damage actually experienced in this country totals, therefore, about \$500 million a year under the present state of development.

I am impressed with the thoroughness with which these projects have been studied and presented to the Congress by the Corps of Engineers in accordance with specific authorization by Congress. Detailed project reports have been submitted and printed as public documents so that all of the data explaining and supporting the proposed work are avail-

able as public information. These projects have been carefully considered by the Committees on Public Works of the House and of the Senate. It is the feeling of the committee that they will contribute to the national economy and welfare. We believe that there is adequate justification for the Federal participation in these improvements and we wholeheartedly recommend approval of the bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 14, it is proposed to insert:

Saginaw River, Mich.: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,496,800.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This amendment would authorize a navigation project for the deepening of the Saginaw River in Michigan. The Saginaw River is an important artery of commerce leading from the industrial cities of Saginaw and Bay City, Mich., into Lake Huron. In the 10-year period 1941 through 1950, commerce on the river averaged 2,771,829 tons a year, and I believe it has increased since then.

The project was submitted to Congress on August 2, after the Committee on Public Works had reported H. R. 9859. There were no adverse comments on this navigation project.

The project would cost \$4,496,800 in Federal costs, plus \$713,300 in local costs. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.41 to 1. Local interests would be responsible for providing certain land and rights of way, as well as protecting the existing bridges across the river.

Because the project came to Congress after the Committee had acted on the bill, I feel clearly justified in offering it on the floor and in asking the Committee and the Senate to approve the amendment so that it may be taken to conference.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this project came in a little too late for the committee to consider it before we finished work on the bill. However, as the Senator from Michigan states, everything had been properly cleared.

I will say to Members of the Senate that, owing to the lateness of the date, I do not know just what can be done in conference. I have discussed what is in the bill at the present time with Members of the House. I believe this amendment has great merit. At a later session the committee approved it. I am will to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and I are presented with a very similar situation. We received from the Bureau of the Budget and from the Chief of Engineers a report after the committee had acted on the bill. I believe the Senator is familiar with the Navarro Mills Dam

on Richland Creek. Is this project somewhat similar to that?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, what the senior Senator from Texas says is absolutely correct. The project to which he refers has received consideration by our staff, but the request was received too late for us to make the item a part of the bill. We have not yet acted on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEX.

The project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 28, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,969,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk. I wish to ask some questions about it. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

WEST SHORE OF LAKE ERIE

The projects for flood protection along the shores of Lake Erie are hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document No. 424, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,900,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the Record at this point a statement I have prepared with regard to this project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

I direct the attention of the Senate to two badly needed flood-control projects in the State of Michigan, which were not included in its version of the omnibus public works bill.

Both these projects are on the west shore of Lake Erie, in Monroe County. They are located at communities known as Lakewood-Luna Pier and Detroit Beach-Woodland Beach, each of which comprises approximately 500 homes. Their protection from flood damage has been estimated by the Corps of Engineers to cost \$1,900,000.

In March 1952, those communities were devastated by floods caused by the high level of Lake Erie and strong northeasterly winds. Damage at both points exceeded a half million dollars.

Committees on Public Works in both the House and the Senate failed to include the projects in their respective omnibus public-works bills because of a legal technicality. The Corps of Engineers recommended both projects as meritorious and deserving of con-

struction. The Public Works Committees of the House and Senate did not disagree with the engineers on the merits.

The technicality was raised by the Bureau of the Budget in a letter to the Secretary of the Army, dated May 10, 1954. The point raised by the Bureau was simply this:

That Federal flood-control legislation does not specifically—I repeat, specifically—cover inundation of property aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects. It suggested that underlying legislation be revised so as to clarify congressional intent with respect to such projects as set forth for Monroe County by the Corps of Engineers.

The cost is estimated as follows:

At Detroit Beach-Woodland Beach, the Government's share would amount to \$508,000, that contributed by local interests, some \$70,000, with a cost-benefit ratio of 1.47. At Lakewood-Luna Pier, the Federal cost would be approximately \$977,000 with local interests to contribute \$122,500. The cost-benefit ratio at that point amounts to 1.24. At Point Place, Ohio, Federal funds totaling \$339,000 have been asked, backed by local contributions totaling \$52,000 with a cost-benefit ratio of 1.26.

I particularly want to emphasize the cost-benefit ratios cited for each project. All exceed the basic ratio of 1 for 1.

Despite the doubt raised by the Budget Bureau, there is precedent for the type of project I ask to be included in the public works bill. Such construction already has been authorized and completed in Lucas County, Ohio, along the shores of the same lake, Lake Erie, known as the Reno Beach.

Howard Farms project contained in the 1948 act. Another precedent was a project for flood control along Lake Ponchartraine in Jefferson Parish, La., in the 1946 act at a total cost of \$1,230,000.

The flood of 1952, to which I referred earlier, caused extensive damage at Estril Beach, Mich., also in Monroe County. Instead of ducking the issue, the Corps of Engineers immediately allocated over \$250,000 from its emergency fund to repair dikes already in existence.

After the flood which I mentioned, in March 1952, the Public Works Committee of the House adopted a resolution on June 26, 1952, in which it instructed the Corps of Engineers to make a study of the high levels of the Great Lakes.

Included in that resolution and in other acts of Congress—and this is of extreme importance to me—was this language: This study by the Corps of Engineers should be undertaken "with a view to determining the property damage resulting from changes in levels of the Great Lakes and the feasibility of measures to prevent the recurrence of damage." Similar language was used in the 1946 Flood Control Act and I believe that in adopting this language, the Congress was indicating its intent that flood-control measures could and should be undertaken in areas where the flood is caused or aggravated by wind or tidal effect, such as is the case with these projects.

The Corps of Army Engineers is of the opinion that the Monroe County, Mich., flood-control projects are authorized by existing law. They so testified before the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate pointing out that Flood Control Acts from 1944 on authorized surveys of damage from wind or tidal effects.

I might add that when the Monroe County projects were recommended by the Corps of Engineers, the St. Lawrence seaway had not yet become law. The seaway, now about to become a reality, makes the construction of the dikes in Monroe County even more necessary.

Their cost will be offset against the reduced necessity for dredging in the channel connecting Lake Erie with the Detroit

River. Higher levels in lake harbors and channels will permit the passage of deep-draft vessels without threat of further damage to low riparian areas. They also result in saving operating costs to bulk, commercial shippers, normally using the lakes on which to carry ore, coal, and wheat.

As long ago as 1925, testimony during the Chicago drainage canal controversy produced figures by the Lake Carriers' Association showing that freight savings or losses amounted to \$500,000 annually for each inch of increase or decrease in depth of navigation channels.

The reason simply is that ships can carry heavier cargoes in deeper channels.

The people of Monroe County have waited patiently for 2½ years for action by the Federal Government. Now we are at the point where relief can be granted on the basis of a careful study by the Corps of Engineers who have recommended these two projects.

I hope the 83d Congress will not become history without having taken the first basic step of enacting authorizing legislation for this construction work which is so badly needed.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on the amendment I have offered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, this project was not turned down because it lacked merit. However, it is not in accordance with the law. This project, to be approved, would require further authorization.

I shall be glad to attempt to answer any questions the Senator from Michigan wishes to ask.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan, as well as the Representative from the Second District of Michigan, appeared before the committee, where the question was considered, and the committee was sympathetic as concerns the merits of the proposal. However, we were informed that it was the opinion of the committee that this project was not legally authorized. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, that is correct. The project was not turned down because it lacked merit.

Mr. President, I hope I have made it entirely clear that the project was not turned down because it did not have merit. The committee felt that the project did not comply with the law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is, it was not legally covered as an authorized project?

Mr. MARTIN. That was the feeling of the committee. It was not that the project did not have merit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the circumstances, the Senator from Michigan will not press his amendment as a part of this bill. I feel that the Senator from Michigan and Mr. MEADER, the Representative from that district, should present this project to be legally authorized in the next session.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I think that is a very proper way to proceed, and I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Michigan and the Representative from Michigan who appeared before the committee

gave a very thorough and adequate explanation of this project. The committee was very much impressed with the manner in which they presented the project. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, if the law were such as to permit it, the committee would have been in favor of the project. Nothing more could have been done to convince the committee that it was a good project than was done by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my junior colleague [Mr. COOPER] I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 17, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That such authorization shall include the acquisition of lands necessary for wildlife purposes as outlined in said Senate Document 81.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The amendment would not add any cost to the bill. It would merely grant authority to the Corps of Army Engineers to acquire such land as may be needed in replacement. The engineers question whether they have the authority to do it without such authorization. I discussed the question with the chairman of the committee, and, at his request, with the ranking minority member of the committee. I hope the chairman will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MARTIN. The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky have discussed this subject with me. We are unable to say anything about the merits of the proposal, and we are not sure what can be done. If the amendment is taken to conference, we are not sure whether anything can be done with it, without further study and consideration.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to make some legislative history in connection with the amendment.

The Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge, containing approximately 60,000 acres, is located between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. About 6,000 acres of that wildlife refuge will be taken in the construction of the high dam there. It might be said that 6,000 acres is a small percentage of more than 60,000 acres in the wildlife preserve. However, these 6,000 acres constitute the only productive land within that preserve. They provide feed for the geese and wild turkeys which abound in that wildlife preserve. Unless some replacement is made for that land, the remainder of the land will be of no further value as a wildlife preserve.

As I said a short time ago, the amendment would not add anything to the cost of the bill. It would merely give to the engineers the authority to acquire this land when they acquire all the other land which is needed in connection with the construction of the dam, instead of having the Department of the Interior called upon to provide the machinery to acquire the land.

The engineers could do it, provided definite authority was included in the bill to permit them to do it. I ask the chairman if that is a fair statement of the facts.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe the Senator has stated the facts very clearly. However, we are not sure about it. We have done some work on the program, but we are not sure about the authorization.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can assure the chairman of the committee that I have been advised by the engineers that unless such language is added to the bill they will not be authorized to acquire the land.

Mr. MARTIN. I have consulted with the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill and also with the ranking minority member of the committee, and I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference, with the explanation I have made.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I hope the chairman will not only take the amendment to conference, but will endeavor to "sell" the House on the importance of the amendment being retained in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky in urging the conferees to give their most careful attention to the amendment, which has been so ably presented by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

My colleague lives in the section of Kentucky where the improvement will be made. He was once governor of Kentucky, and he is very familiar with the wildlife refuge. I hope very earnestly that the conferees on the part of the Senate will press the request made by my senior colleague and myself. I know that the Senators who will represent this body on the conference committee are familiar with the authority of the Corps in such a field. In analogy, I remember that when the Wolf Creek Dam was built on the Cumberland River the town of Burnside was inundated. In that instance the engineers not only provided relief from the serious damage suffered by businesses and industries which had to move from the inundated areas, but also made arrangements to restore the town to the same comparable condition in which it was before the inundation.

That situation may not be an exact analogy with what my colleague has said, is needed in this case, but it is true that the situation cannot be handled except in the way in which my colleague has described. I urge that the conferees give very serious consideration to our request.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to supplement what has been stated with respect to this bill by the distinguished chairman of the committee and by other members of the committee. However, certain facts in connection with the bill should be included in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The first of two tables found at pages 5 and 6 of the committee report, covers

rivers and harbor projects contained in the House bill. It shows a total of \$212,-915,100.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects in title I of bill as passed by House—Sec. 101

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work	Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Lubee Channel, Maine.....	S. 243, 81st Cong.....	\$74, 000	Bayou Segnette Waterway, La.....	H. 413, 83d Cong.....	\$520, 000
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N. H.....	H. 556, 82d Cong.....	952, 000	Sabine Neebes Waterway, Tex.....	S. 80, 83d Cong.....	6, 875, 000
Lynn Harbor, Mass.....	H. 568, 81st Cong.....	65, 000	Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Tex.....	H. 478, 81st Cong.....	74, 300
Weymouth Fore River, Mass.....	H. 555, 82d Cong.....	4, 400, 000	Aransas Pass, Tex., in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.....	H. 376, 83d Cong.....	30, 700
Town River, Quincy, Mass.....	H. 108, 83d Cong.....	525, 000	Turtle Cove, Tex.....	H. 654, 81st Cong.....	40, 000
Scituate Harbor, Mass.....	H. 241, 83d Cong.....	375, 000	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.....	H. 89, 83d Cong.....	829, 100
Fall River Harbor, Mass.....	H. 405, 83d Cong.....	694, 000	Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.....	H. 251, 82d Cong.....	82, 600
Bullocks Point Cove, R. I.....	H. 242, 83d Cong.....	166, 400	Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.....	H. 230, 83d Cong.....	65, 000
Sakonnet Harbor, R. I.....	H. 436, 82d Cong.....	555, 400	Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minn.....	H. 347, 83d Cong.....	142, 000
Patehogue River, Conn.....	H. 164, 83d Cong.....	135, 000	Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.....	S. 81, 83d Cong.....	3, 434, 000
Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn.....	H. 488, 81st Cong.....	112, 500	Green and Barren River, Ky.....	H. 463, 83d Cong.....	219, 900
Westchester Creek, N. Y.....	H. 92, 82d Cong.....	32, 200	Knife River Harbor, Minn.....	H. 434, 83d Cong.....	220, 000
Hudson River, N. Y.....	H. 228, 83d Cong.....	31, 928, 000	Cornucopia Harbor, Wis.....	H. 554, 82d Cong.....	217, 200
Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.....	H. 89, 82d Cong.....	138, 000	Holland Harbor, Mich.....	H. 282, 83d Cong.....	574, 400
Haekensack River, N. J.....	H. 252, 82d Cong.....	1, 973, 900	Crooked and Indian Rivers, Mich.....	H. 142, 82d Cong.....	225, 000
Mispillion River, Del.....	S. 229, 81st Cong.....	469, 400	Toledo Harbor, Ohio.....	H. 620, 81st Cong.....	512, 000
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.....	S. 123, 83d Cong.....	101, 000, 000	Erie Harbor, Pa.....	H. 345, 83d Cong.....	174, 000
Queenstown Harbor, Md.....	H. 718, 81st Cong.....	31, 900	Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.....	H. 423, 83d Cong.....	270, 000
Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Annes County, Md.....	H. 715, 81st Cong.....	23, 000	Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, N. Y.....	H. 246, 83d Cong.....	36, 900
Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Md.....	H. 90, 82d Cong.....	29, 000	Oswego Harbor, N. Y.....	H. 487, 81st Cong.....	2, 450, 000
Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md.....	H. 91, 82d Cong.....	192, 600	Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor, Calif.....	H. 161, 83d Cong.....	896, 500
Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 619, 81st Cong.....	20, 300	Llaja del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif.....	H. 389, 83d Cong.....	3, 869, 000
Crisfield Harbor, Md.....	H. 435, 81st Cong.....	101, 750	Port Hueneme, Calif.....	H. 362, 83d Cong.....	5, 437, 000
Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Md.....	H. 51, 82d Cong.....	45, 100	Rogue River, harbor at Gold Beach, Oreg.....	S. 83, 83d Cong.....	3, 758, 700
Pocomoke River, Md.....	H. 486, 81st Cong.....	678, 300	Umpqua Harbor and River, Schofield River at Reedsport, Oreg.....	S. 133, 81st Cong.....	41, 000
Ocean City Harbor and Inlet, Sinepuxent Bay, Md.....	H. 444, 82d Cong.....	704, 000	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington.....	H. 249, 83d Cong.....	8, 555, 000
Parrotts Creek, Va.....	H. 46, 82d Cong.....	38, 700	Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island.....	S. 8, 83d Cong.....	227, 100
Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.....	S. 122, 83d Cong.....	6, 138, 700	Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Wash.....	H. 425, 83d Cong.....	977, 000
Deep Creek, Accomack County, Va.....	H. 477, 81st Cong.....	95, 000	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.....	H. 412, 83d Cong.....	421, 800
Oyster Channel, Va.....	S. 49, 83d Cong.....	75, 200	Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven breakwater), Wash.....	H. —, 83d Cong.....	323, 700
Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, N. C.....	H. 453, 81st Cong.....	108, 000	Anacortes Harbor, Wash.....	S. 102, 83d Cong.....	\$179, 300
Smiths Creek, N. C.....	H. 170, 83d Cong.....	102, 000	Neah Bay, Wash.....	H. 404, 83d Cong.....	139, 250
Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, N. C.....	H. 411, 83d Cong.....	175, 000	Bellingham Harbor, Wash.....	H. 558, 82d Cong.....	1, 366, 650
Peltier Creek, N. C., to Intracoastal Waterway.....	H. 379, 81st Cong.....	43, 200	Blaine Harbor, Wash.....	H. 240, 83d Cong.....	436, 000
Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, S. C.....	H. 469, 81st Cong.....	765, 000	Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Wash.....	H. 536, 81st Cong.....	3, 397, 300
Savannah Harbor, Ga.....	H. 110, 83d Cong.....	414, 900	Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.....	H. 155, 82d Cong.....	477, 900
Rice Creek, Putnam County, Fla.....	H. 446, 82d Cong.....	82, 200	Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Wash.....	H. 569, 81st Cong.....	395, 500
Hillsboro River, Fla.....	H. 567, 81st Cong.....	16, 600	Quillayute River, Wash.....	H. 579, 81st Cong.....	425, 550
Apalachicola Bay, Fla.....	H. 156, 82d Cong.....	98, 000	Seward Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 182, 83d Cong.....	81, 200
Apalachicola Bay, Fla., channel across St. George Island.....	H. 557, 82d Cong.....	635, 700	Valdez Harbor, Alaska.....	do.....	116, 600
St. Joseph Bay, Fla.....	H. 595, 81st Cong.....	1, 312, 000	Honolulu Harbor, T. H.....	H. 717, 81st Cong.....	3, 022, 000
Mobile Harbor, Ala.....	H. 74, 83d Cong.....	5, 778, 000	Total.....		212, 915, 100
Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.....	H. 394, 82d Cong.....	70, 000			

¹ H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the second table I ask to have included in the RECORD at this point appears at page 6 of the committee report. It shows the

rivers and harbors projects placed in the bill by the Senate committee. The total is \$106,303,300.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments—Projects recommended by Senate committee—Items added (sec. 101)

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work	Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.....	H. 358, 83d Cong.....	\$91, 389, 000	Tacoma Harbor, Wash.....		\$634, 200
Wilmington Harbor, N. C. (reimbursement).....		0	Sitka Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 414, 83d Cong.....	41, 500
Charleston Harbor, S. C.....	S. 136, 83d Cong.....	200, 000	Dry Pass, Alaska.....	do.....	1, 419, 800
Carabelle Harbor, Fla. (maintenance only).....	H. 451, 83d Cong.....	0	Neva Strait, Alaska.....	do.....	224, 400
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.....		877, 000	Kodiak Harbor, Alaska.....	H. 465, 83d Cong.....	1, 685, 000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.....		180, 000	Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, T. H.....	H. 453, 83d Cong.....	1, 166, 400
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio.....		4, 900, 000	Total.....		106, 303, 300
Richmond Harbor, Calif.....	H. 395, 83d Cong.....	2, 086, 000			
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.....	S. 128, 83d Cong.....	1, 500, 000			

¹ H. denotes House document; S. denotes Senate document.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the third list covers the projects in the field of beach erosion control. The table is found at page 19 of the report. The total cost, so far as the Federal portion

only is concerned—and the Federal portion generally is one-third of the total cost—is \$14,003,664. I ask unanimous consent that that table be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beach erosion control—Projects in bill as passed by House

Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work	Projects	Document No. ¹	Federal cost of new work
Hampton Beach, N. H.	H. 325, 83d Cong.	\$140,000	Ocean City, N. J.	H. 184, 83d Cong.	\$105,000
Lynn-Nahant Beach, Mass.	H. 134, 82d Cong.	189,000	Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), N. J.	H. 206, 83d Cong.	260,000
Revere Beach, Mass.	H. 146, 82d Cong.	402,900	Virginia Beach, Va.	H. 186, 83d Cong.	525,514
Quincy Shore Beach, Mass.	H. 145, 82d Cong.	409,000	Pinellas County, Fla.	H. 380, 83d Cong.	34,300
South Shore, State of Rhode Island.	H. 490, 81st Cong.	166,550	Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan	H. 28, 83d Cong.	1,176,400
Hammonasset River to East River (area 2), Conn.	H. 474, 81st Cong.		Vermillion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio	H. 229, 83d Cong.	185,000
Hammonasset Beach.		166,600	Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio.	H. 502, 81st Cong.	
Middle Beach.		20,400	Edgewater Park.		1,275,000
New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (area 3), Conn.	H. 203, 83d Cong.		White City Park.		68,900
Prospect Beach.		84,600	Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.	H. 231, 83d Cong.	2,006,000
Woodmont Shore.		42,400	Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, N. Y.	H. 343, 83d Cong.	136,500
Gulf Beach.		13,100	Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, Calif.	H. 277, 83d Cong.	3,874,000
Silver Beach to Cedar Beach.		18,300	Anaheim Bay Harbor, Calif.	H. 349, 83d Cong.	
Housatonic River to Ash Creek (area 7), Conn.	H. 248, 83d Cong.		Seal Beach.		65,700
Short Beach.		26,500	Surfside.		91,600
Seaside Park.		119,000	Carpenteria to Point Mugu, Calif.	H. 29, 83d Cong.	73,700
Atlantic City, N. J.	H. 538, 81st Cong.	2,044,000	Waikiki Beach, T. H.	H. 227, 83d Cong.	283,700
			Total.		14,003,664

¹ H. indicates House document.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the flood-control projects covered by the bill fall into two categories. The first category covers the projects which are included in the House bill. The table showing those projects is found at pages

22 and 23 of the committee report. The table shows new flood-control projects in the amount of \$294,852,750.

The total increases in the earlier authorizations as approved by the House, are \$368,500,000. I ask unanimous con-

sent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects in title II of bill as passed by House—Sec. 203

Project	Document No. ¹	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects	Project	Document No. ¹	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Connecticut River Basin:				Upper Mississippi River—Con.			
Modification of project to provide for Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H.				Sny Island levee, Levee Drainage District, Ill.	H. 247, 83d Cong.	\$7,046,300	
Modification of plan for West River Basin, Vt.				Upper Iowa River, Iowa.	H. 375, 83d Cong.	979,600	
Susquehanna River, vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vostal, N. Y.	H. 500, 81st Cong.	\$4,469,000		Missouri River Basin authorization.			\$144,000,000
Central and southern Florida (modification of project).	H. 643, 80th Cong.		\$7,000,000	Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas.	H. 642, 81st Cong.	73,710,000	
Lower Mississippi River:				Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, modification of project.	H. 549, 81st Cong.		
Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and lock for navigation.	(?)	32,000,000		Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., modification of project.			
Channel in Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, La.	S. 53, 82d Cong.	440,000		Charlton River, Iowa and Mo.	H. 561, 81st Cong.	19,612,000	
Modification of project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area.	H. 85, 83d Cong.			Little Sioux River, Iowa.	S. 127, 83d Cong.	10,076,000	
Modification of project for New Madrid floodway.	H. 183, 83d Cong.	1,743,000		Little Missouri River and tributaries at Marmarth, N. Dak.	S. 134, 81st Cong.	212,300	
Buffalo Bayou Basin, flood protection at Houston, Tex.	H. 250, 83d Cong.	16,191,600		Coal Creek and tributaries, Tenn.	H. 154, 82d Cong.	745,200	
Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex.	H. 535, 81st Cong.	40,000,000		Ohio River Basin: Sandy Lick Creek, vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pa.	H. 716, 81st Cong.	570,000	
Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Tex.	H. 344, 83d Cong.	30,254,000		Paint Rock River, Ala.	H. —, 83d Cong.	1,001,300	
Guadalupe River, Tex. (modification of project for Canyon Dam).				Kalamazoo River, Mich.	S. 98, 83d Cong.	4,201,550	
Rio Grande Basin:				Little Calumet River, Ind.	H. 153, 82d Cong.	509,900	
At Albuquerque, N. Mex.	H. 464, 83d Cong.	7,500,000		Los Angeles-San Gabriel Basin and Ballona Creek, Calif.			12,500,000
At Roswell, N. Mex., on Rio Hondo River.	H. 436, 83d Cong.	5,658,000		Sacramento River Basin:			
White River Basin: Modification of plan for Greers Ferry Reservoir, Ark., and authorization of Beaver Reservoir, Ark.	(?)			Middle Creek, Calif.	H. 367, 81st Cong.	1,110,000	
Arkansas River and tributaries, at Enid, Okla.	H. 185, 83d Cong.	965,000		American River, Calif.	H. 367, 81st Cong.	1,600,000	
Upper Mississippi River:				Lower San Joaquin River Basin.			5,000,000
Urban areas at Alton, Ill.	H. 397, 83d Cong.	2,500,000		Columbia River Basin: Modification of project to include power development at Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oreg., and Green Peter Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg., including White Bridge regulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oreg.	H. 531, 81st Cong.		180,000,000
Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Ill.	H. 281, 83d Cong.	30,551,000		Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska.	H. 54, 82d Cong.	380,000	
Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District, No. 8, Monroe County, Ill.	H. 396, 83d Cong.	480,000		Wailoa Stream and its tributaries, island of Hawaii, T. H.	H. 529, 81st Cong.	347,000	
				Department of Agriculture, sec. 205, prosecution of works heretofore authorized.			20,000,000
				Total.		294,852,750	368,500,000

¹ H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

² Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Apr. 8, 1954.

³ Report of the Chief of Engineers dated Feb. 19, 1954.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my last request covers the amendments placed in the bill by the Senate committee in the field of flood control, totaling \$62,850,300, as shown in the table found

on page 23 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments—Projects recommended by Senate committee—Items added (sec. 203)

Projects	Document No. ¹	Estimated Federal cost	Projects	Document No. ¹	Estimated Federal cost
West Branch of Susquehanna River, Pa.		\$25,000,000	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak., facilities at Pollock, S. Dak.		\$200,000
Reelfoot Lake area, Kentucky and Tennessee		748,100	Heart River at Mandan, S. Dak.		1,727,000
Belton Reservoir, Tex. (reservation of water supply for Fort Hood).		0	Santa Maria River and tributaries, California	H. 400, 83d Cong.	10,182,000
Pecos River, N. Mex. and Tex.		9,540,000	San Lorenzo River, Calif.	H. 447, 83d Cong.	2,665,000
Conway County Drainage and Levee District, Arkansas	H. 167, 82d Cong.	230,600	San Lorenzo Creek, Calif.	H. 452, 83d Cong.	3,790,000
Holla Bend Bottom, Ark.	H. 157, 82d Cong.	312,000	Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada.		791,000
Bear Creek, Mo.	H. 435, 83d Cong.	3,326,000	mazon Creek, Oreg.	S. 131, 83d Cong.	893,600
Big Sioux River and tributaries, Iowa and South Dakota.		3,430,000	Total		62,850,300
Cold Brook Dam, S. Dak.		15,000			

¹ H. indicates House document; S. indicates Senate document.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the total of these 5 tables as inserted in the RECORD will be found to be approximately \$1,050,000,000 of authorizations, as mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] in his opening remarks.

Notwithstanding the fact that it has been more than 4 years since a bill of this kind has been passed, it is the smallest bill in this field that has been considered by Congress for many years. That fact indicates a conservative approach, and indicates also that there is a large backlog of earlier authorizations, which have not been reached and which have added to the complexities of the situation.

I have asked that these items be included in the RECORD for the information of all who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out on page 39, lines 13 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this amendment is a little unique. It proposes to make the amount in the bill a wee bit smaller. The reason for it is that the item has been taken care of by a bill which passed on the Consent Calendar some time ago, and which has been passed by the House of Representatives since this bill was reported. Consequently, there is no need of this language in the bill, and it might as well be deleted from the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from South

Dakota is very much in conformity with his very careful legislative work. I do not think I have ever been associated with anyone who is so careful as is the Senator from South Dakota. It will be a great pleasure to accept his amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

At Petersburg Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

Pelican Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

Ketchikan Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$2,947,900;

Rocky Pass, in the Keku Strait, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$214,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an explanation of these items. They have been approved not only by the Corps of Engineers but by the Bureau of the Budget. Like several other amendments which have been accepted today, they came in too late for the House to consider them, and I hope the Senate conferees will take them to conference.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARBORS OF SOUTHEASTERN ALASKA (REPORT OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, DATED APRIL 8, 1954)

LOCATION

That portion of the Territory known as the Panhandle area, consisting of a narrow strip of mountainous mainlands, together with the islands of the Alexander Archipelago lying immediately offshore.

REPORT AUTHORIZED BY

Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948; river and harbor acts of July 24, 1946, and May 17, 1950; and resolutions of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors dated October 30, 1945, and July 13, 1949.

Existing project: 15 projects in southeast Alaska have been adopted to facilitate navigation. Petersburg: Dredging approaches to the wharves 24 feet deep, a small-boat basin 8½ acres in extent, 11 feet deep, and a short channel 8 feet deep and 40 feet wide to the south of the Forest Service float. Ketchikan: Stone breakwater with concrete cap 940 feet long and a small-boat basin 10 feet deep.

PLAN OF RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT

Petersburg: Modification of existing project to provide for dredging the outer one-third of the small-boat basin to a depth of 15 feet. Pelican: Construction of a small-boat basin 12 feet deep and protected by a breakwater 1,000 feet long. Ketchikan: Modification of the existing project to provide a small-boat basin at Bar Point dredged to a depth of 15 feet or to rock, and protected by two stone breakwaters 700 feet and 1,550 feet long. Keku Strait at Rocky Pass: Improvement of Rocky Pass in Keku Strait by removing rock hazards to provide a channel with a minimum depth of 5 feet and a width of 150 feet at the Summit and 200 feet at Devils Elbow.

Estimated cost (report 1952 prices)

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Petersburg Harbor	\$40,000		\$40,000
Pelican Harbor	270,000	\$20,000	290,000
Ketchikan Harbor	2,947,900	127,000	3,074,900
Rocky Pass in Keku Strait	214,000		214,000
Total	3,471,900	147,000	3,618,900

Local cooperation: Furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including quarry rights and spoil-disposal areas; construct, maintain, and operate mooring facilities and public landing; and hold and save the United States free from damages.

Project economics

	Petersburg	Pelican	Ketchikan	Rocky Pass
Annual charges:				
Interest and amortization.....	\$1,560	\$11,960	\$115,000	\$8,700
Maintenance.....		1,200	12,000	2,300
Total.....	1,560	13,160	127,000	11,000
Annual benefits:				
Prevention of damage or loss.....	3,500	4,450	138,000	-----
Transportation savings.....		4,800	18,000	18,000
Increased fish catch.....		5,400		-----
Total.....	3,500	14,650	156,000	18,000
Benefit-cost ratio.....	2.24	1.1	1.23	1.63

REMARKS

The economy of this section of Alaska, with its many islands, sparse population, and widely scattered settlements, is dependent on water transportation. There are several thousand boats using the harbors and waterways of the area. These projects are needed to protect fishing craft and other vessels from damage, decrease transportation costs to the fishing grounds and timber areas, and result in an increased value of the fish catch.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in accordance with the statements which I have made with reference to other amendments, this amendment has been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, but it did come in too late, and I do not know what the House conferees may do. We shall make every effort to press for its adoption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point correspondence with reference to the Tacoma Harbor dredging project.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1954.

Re Tacoma Harbor dredging project (port industrial waterway)

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In further reference to my letter of June 7, 1954, the Pacific Oil & Refining Co. advised me, under date of July 13, 1954, that it has requested the Office of Defense Mobilization to amend its presently existing Certificate of Necessity TA-NC-24054 to include an alkylation unit in the interests of national defense.

We are pleased with this development since, as indicated in my previous letter to you, the Department of Defense is vitally interested in the construction of alkylation facilities in the Pacific Northwest area.

It is hoped that the necessary arrangements can be made in connection with the Tacoma Harbor dredging project which, if

completed, will enable the Pacific Oil & Refining Co. to proceed with the construction of their refinery.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WHITE,
Brigadier General, USAF,
Staff Director, Petroleum Logistics Division.

MAY 26, 1954.

Re Tacoma Harbor dredging project (Port industrial waterway)

Col. W. W. WHITE,
Office, Secretary of Defense,
Supply and Logistics,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL WHITE: Recently the Chief of Engineers has received a very favorable report from the Seattle district engineers approving the above-named project. The report recommends a Federal investment of \$634,000 to complete this waterway. To date the local interests have spent in excess of \$2 million. The project is sorely needed to provide new deep water frontage for the port of Tacoma. This calls for dredging a 3/4-mile waterway 30 feet in depth and about 800 feet wide.

One of the industries which intends to locate on this waterway involves an oil refinery. The refinery group intends to begin construction as soon as dredging of the waterway is assured and as soon as sufficient dredging has been accomplished, to provide a fill where storage tanks, etc., will be located.

The Washington Processing Co. is a participant in the refinery syndicate group and is currently acting as agent and spokesman for the larger organization. Recently this company advised the Tacoma Port Commission that in addition to the installation of modern type catalytic thermal reforming units, capable of producing 100-octane gasoline, it is planned to include an alkylation unit which will then make possible production of aviation gasoline. I am enclosing a copy of a letter which Mr. W. G. French, of Washington Processing Co., Inc., recently sent to the Tacoma Port Commissioners stating this intent.

As I understand it, there is still a considerable shortage of production facilities for aviation gasoline. In addition, there are no such facilities located in the Pacific Northwest. Such a facility in the area would be of great value to the Defense Department in supplying installations in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

The oil refinery and alkylation facilities have been granted a tax amortization certificate. Their location in Tacoma is dependent upon early authorization and completion of the Port Industrial Waterway.

I am wondering if you would be willing to check into this matter from defense point of view and let me know what interest, if any, your department would have in the location of a refinery and alkylation unit in Tacoma. Since the waterway and these facilities are dependent one upon the other, the national defense importance of the installation will have some bearing on the speed with which we can get the waterway project through the Congress.

For your further information, legislative action is being correlated as much as possible with the procedures of the Corps of Engineers. I and other members of the Washington State delegation are trying to achieve authorization of the waterway in this session of Congress. If the project is approved for inclusion in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill, we will seek an appropriation before adjournment. The time, therefore, is short. Your statement regarding the importance of the project for the national defense in terms of the oil refinery and aviation gasoline installation dependent upon the waterway completion will be most helpful.

I'll appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience. Best regards.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I should like to have the clerk read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 14, after "\$91,389,000", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the incremental depth from 35 feet to 40 feet shall be provided by the Federal Government subject to the condition that local interests contribute one-half of the cost of such incremental depth in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in such document.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I should like to say that on page 4 of the bill there is an authorization for the Delaware River of \$91,389,000. The sum of \$36 million of the \$91 million is for dredging the Delaware River from the Philadelphia Navy Yard to the United States Steel Works, at a cost of \$36 million. Because only the United States Steel Co. is going to benefit from this dredging to 40 feet, the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and the Bureau of the Budget, all of them, have recommended that the United States Steel Co. should pay half the cost. Unfortunately, the committee did not choose to follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, the Corps of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army. Therefore, the entire \$36 million will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States. I think it is most regrettable. While I recognize that this is an authorization, nevertheless, I believe the Senate should go on record and request the United States Steel Co., which is the only local interest to benefit from the dredging to 40 feet, to pay half the cost.

The Chief of Engineers, in a report to the Senate dated November 18, 1953, said:

All evidence indicates that the use of depths greater than 35 feet now or in the foreseeable future will be confined to a single company and, in accordance with established policy, the greater depth required by this single company warrants a substantial cash contribution to the incremental cost of the greater depth. I believe, therefore, that the incremental depth from 35 to 40 feet should be provided by the Federal Government subject to the condition that the United States Steel Co., or other local interests, contribute one-half of the cost of the incremental depth, this half being presently estimated at about \$18 million.

Secretary of the Army Stevens, on March 19, 1954, said:

I do not believe that any evidence now available indicates that prospective general commerce on the river, other than iron-ore receipts, will require more than a 35-foot depth. It appears true that additional economic benefits will accrue directly to the United States Steel Corp., from a 40-foot channel, and there seems every reason for the beneficiary to participate in the project.

Finally, Mr. President, the Budget Director, Mr. Hughes, said, on February 25, 1954:

We believe that no exception should be made to the long-established principle and practice in such cases of requiring local participation in the cost and that the amount of the cash contribution proposed by the Chief of Engineers in this case is reasonable.

There is no reason why the United States Steel Co., which is the only company which could possibly benefit from dredging the river from 35 feet to 40 feet, should not pay half the cost. The company is having iron ore carriers built in Japan to carry ore from Venezuela. Yet, Mr. President, it is the taxpayers who will have to pay the other half of the cost of deepening this channel. In view of the statements by the Bureau of the Budget, the Chief of Engineers, and Secretary Stevens, I see no justification for the United States Steel Co. not paying half the cost. It is a local company which is going to benefit from the project. It is for that reason that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is absent, and I have offered this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts that I cannot give the name of the concern, but 2,500 acres of land have been optioned on the New Jersey side of the river, opposite the Fairless steel plant for the construction of another steel plant in the Delaware Valley.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. DUFF. I believe it is the National Steel Co., which is one of the largest steel companies, ranking very close to the United States Steel Co., which has acquired this land and which expects to make another installation at the point which the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate what my distinguished colleague has stated.

I should like the Senate to have this information. The port of Philadelphia is one of the oldest ports of our Nation.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia, and the railroads have spent on that port one-third of a billion dollars. The population is increasing very rapidly in Bucks County, which is on the Pennsylvania side of the river. There are 8,000 industries in the Philadelphia area, in the States of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

During the war there was probably more critical war production in this valley than in any other place in the United States. From the standpoint of defense alone, this project should be approved.

I am fearful that if we permitted the United States Steel Co. to make an appropriation of \$18 million, it would be a bad precedent. I feel that the waterways of our country ought to be free and without any possible understanding that

any individual or any corporation has priority in their use.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] agree with me that the committee considered this question very carefully, and that it was pointed out to us that there is no precedent for the type of suggestion which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] makes for himself and on behalf of the Senator from Illinois. There is no precedent for such contributions where general commerce is involved.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that Colonel Milne was asked that question before the Senator's committee on May 13, and that he stated for the Corps of Engineers:

There have been a number of examples, Mr. Chairman, where the Corps of Engineers has recommended a local cash contribution and such contribution has been approved by the Congress and has been made by those interests.

He then proceeded to give the Senator 4 or 5 examples.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator have the examples before him?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have. Colonel Milne stated:

Some specific examples that come to my mind: In the New England area, in Town River, Mass.—

He went on to say that the people of Town River, Mass., contributed 25 percent.

In the case of Houston ship channel—

Mr. BUSH. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. KENNEDY. Page 42 of the Senator's committee hearings.

Mr. BUSH. Of the hearings?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct. Colonel Milne talks about the Stockton deepwater channel in California, where the local interests paid one-half the cost.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. We are trying to get at the facts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am very anxious that the Senate and the people of America have all possible information relative to the development of the Delaware Valley. I do not know whether Senators realize it or not, but using Philadelphia as the center, within 100 miles we have 1 percent of the area of the United States, but 14 percent of the population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired. Does the Senator wish to yield himself additional time?

Mr. BUSH. Will the other side yield 2 minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY. How much more time have we left on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five minutes remain to the Senator's side.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. The point I should like to make is this: There is no precedent for this kind of contribution where general commerce is involved. That is my position, and I believe it to be accurate. The examples which the Senator was reading, I believe, are not similar examples. Sometimes local contributions are obtained. That has been true not infrequently where land enhancement was involved. But when there is involved the deepening of a channel for the improvement of general commerce and the general service of the area, I submit that my information is that there is no precedent for this kind of contribution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I should also like to emphasize, if the Senator will permit me, that this improvement should not be regarded solely as a benefit to the United States Steel Corp. The United States Steel Corp. is a very important element in the entire economy of this area, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has pointed out. There are other industrial organizations there which will benefit by this improvement. I think the Senate should not be given the impression that we are doing a favor to the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the Senator should understand that increasing the depth from 35 to 40 feet is not for the general industrial development of the area. I would not object to that at all. The fact is that the only company which can possibly need the additional depth from 35 to 40 feet, is the United States Steel Corp. I quote from the report of the Senate Committee on Public Works:

Extension to Trenton is necessary due to the recent construction of a large modern steel plant by the United States Steel Corp. below Morrisville, Pa. This plant will receive high iron content ores from Venezuela and other foreign sources directly by water and is vital to national defense and national welfare.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether or not he thinks it would be of great benefit to that whole area if the company installed such a plant.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Massachusetts is stating that the industrial benefit is to the United States Steel Corp. Is that not the fact?

Mr. BUSH. I say the benefit is to the whole area.

Mr. KENNEDY. Because it benefits the United States Steel?

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will have it that way.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point is that, as the Corps of Engineers stated, the reason for dredging to 40 feet is the construction by United States Steel in Japan of extra large carriers. For the general commerce of the river, dredging to a depth of 35 feet is sufficient.

I would support that statement. The Corps of Engineers stated that if the depth were to be increased to 40 feet the local interests which would be directly benefited should bear one-half the cost.

Mr. BUSH. The committee felt, on the other hand that the dredging of the additional depth would so improve commerce that it would better the situation for the entire area, and not solely for the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator may recall that it was stated before his committee that United States Steel was the only company which would need dredging to that depth; that all other commerce or the interests of the area could be served by dredging to 35 feet. It was because of the extra large ore vessels that it was necessary to dredge to 40 feet.

Mr. BUSH. The committee did not feel that there was anything particularly evil about that. The committee was thinking about the improvement of navigation in order to benefit the whole industrial and economic situation in that area. Someone has to take the leadership in these things. There is no particular disgrace in having the United States Steel Corp. do it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the two Senators will yield for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is this time to be charged to the time of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. MARTIN. No; it can be taken out of my time.

I should like to give the Senate this information:

The number of people employed by the United States Steel Co. in that area is 6,180. One other concern in the locality is the Kaiser Metal Products Co., which employs 9,032.

As my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] stated a moment ago, I know that options are taken on an area opposite the Fairless plant on the Jersey side; and he gave the name of the steel company which intends to erect a plant there.

Mr. KENNEDY. I quote the Chief of Engineers, General Sturgis. He states:

All evidence indicates that the use of depths greater than 35 feet now or in the foreseeable future will be confined to a single company.

There is no indication that the company which the Senator has just named has any need for a channel more than 35 feet deep.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, there is nothing unusual about that situation. It is true that that statement is in the report and in the hearings, but the same situation arises in Texas. I am sorry the Senators from Texas are not present to hear me. One of the projects was the deepening of a channel in a particular waterway in Texas so that oil tankers could get in there. They needed more depth. It was not done for the particular benefit of the Humble Oil Co., or the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. It was done for the benefit of commerce generally in the area.

That is why all these things are done. The fact that the United States Steel Corp. happens to be the particular agency which will use the waterway first, and at the present time is the only one

that may use it at that depth, is not an argument against the project.

Mr. KENNEDY. The only reason—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Whose time is this on?

Mr. KENNEDY. This is on my time, and then I shall conclude.

The only reason I argue the point is that it is the position taken by the Corps of Engineers, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Secretary of the Army. For the Congress of the United States to authorize the expenditure of \$36 million for the benefit of one company, however important the company may be, seems to me to be establishing a most dangerous precedent. Therefore, the amendment which we have offered is in accordance with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Fairless, speaking in Georgia on October 30, 1952, stated:

But real economy can never be achieved in Washington by the effort of Congress alone. It cannot be accomplished by hacking splinters at the edges of an executive budget that is wasteful to the core; for real economy is not merely a legislative act—it is a state of mind.

It seems to me we have an opportunity, in accordance with the recommendations of the administration—and I think they are 100 percent right—to ask that the local interests pay one-half the cost.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to make 1 or 2 additional observations.

The Senator's figure of \$36 million is the gross figure, and I believe the amendment proposes that half of that cost be borne by the company, not all of it.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is in accordance with the amendment—one-half.

Mr. BUSH. So that we are talking about \$18 million, and not \$36 million.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. It is still a great deal of money. I agree with the Senator about that, but I think the Senate should stand on its precedents, and there is no precedent for this kind of a split in this kind of a project where general commerce is involved. There have been many cases in which local contributions have been made, but not in this kind of case. I wish the RECORD to show that is the reason why the committee acted unanimously, as it did in connection with the report.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to say that the House did not have a chance to consider this matter. Therefore, there were no House hearings held, and the House bill did not contain this amendment. Therefore, if the Senate passes the bill and it goes to conference, this will be the only action Congress will have taken in approving or disapproving the amendment. Therefore, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to have something printed in the RECORD that pertains to the amendment?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Governor of New Jersey, a telegram from the Governor of Pennsylvania, a telegram from the mayor of Philadelphia, a telegram from the mayor of Camden, N. J., and a telegram from the mayor of the city of Trenton.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENTON, N. J., August 12, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senator:

Deepening of Delaware River Channel from Philadelphia to Trenton vitally important to future development of Delaware Valley, United States of America. Urge immediate passage pending legislation.

ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor of New Jersey.

HARRISBURG, PA., August 11, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD MARTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that the Senate will start debate on the Delaware Channel deepening proposal today. Over the past several months you and I have frequently discussed the importance of action in this field. I want to reaffirm my position on the vital necessity for this action at the Federal level. Properly and traditionally channels are the responsibility of the Federal Government. This channel is vital to the interest of our 3-State area in the further industrial expansion along its 30-mile river front. Call upon the Commonwealth for any possible help we can afford you in the furtherance of this program.

JOHN S. FINE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 5, 1954.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building:

I have today sent the following telegram to the members of the House Public Works Committee: "Request your support of full authorization for channel dredging from Philadelphia to Trenton. Local contribution scheme proposed to finance part of this project is unprecedented in scope and would only delay or prevent completion of this essential improvement. The project, involving the regular Federal responsibility for navigable waters, is vital to the continued development of the Philadelphia area. The resulting productive capacity will be a big factor in national security."

JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor of Philadelphia.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 5, 1954.

EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building:

I hope the Senate will endorse the full authorization for Delaware River Channel dredging from Philadelphia to Trenton. The local contribution formula put forward as a way to finance this project is unprecedented in scope and cannot be relied upon for this essential improvement. This project fits in with the regular Federal responsibility for navigable waters and is very important in the continued development of productive capacity which will benefit not only the Philadelphia area but the entire Nation.

JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor.

CAMDEN, N. J., August 11, 1954.

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building:

Forty-foot channel in Delaware River important to States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Request your full support on this matter.

GEORGE E. BRUNNER,
Mayor, City of Camden.

TRENTON, N. J., August, 11, 1954.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN:

The Delaware Valley is one of the most important manufacturing marketing and service areas of the world. Within a radius of 250 miles, 50 million people live, including approximately 14,300,000 families with an effective annual buying income estimated at more than \$70 billion. There is probably no better, more concentrated, or richer market in the world. Trenton may be considered as being in the center of this important business and industrial territory. As mayor of this city of Trenton, may I advise you that all the people of this area, regardless of political affiliation, feel that a deep water channel in the Delaware River between Trenton and Philadelphia is essential for their continuance and prosperity.

DONALD J. CONNELLY,
Mayor of the City of Trenton.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I feel that the objection to the expenditure minimizes the importance of the great Port of Philadelphia. I have before me a map showing the course of the Delaware River from the Bay up to Trenton, near which the steel plant is located. From the course of the argument, it would seem that between Philadelphia and Trenton there was practically no development except that of the United States Steel Corporation. An analysis of the map will show that the distance from Philadelphia to where the United States Steel plant is located is almost half the distance along the Delaware River from Philadelphia all the way down to the bay. It so happens that in this immediate area, in the neighborhood of the Port of Philadelphia, there are already 8,000 manufacturing plants of every description. Furthermore, there are underway plans for the construction of further large installations in addition to those of the steel plants.

As everyone who is familiar with the steel industry in this country knows, the National Steel Co. is one of the great producers of steel in America. As the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out, that company has already taken an option on 2,500 acres in the general area of where the United States Steel plant is located, unquestionably for the same reasons for which the United States Steel Corp. located there, namely, the accessibility of that area to the great fresh-water port of Philadelphia.

I am sure that any person acquainted with the terrain from Philadelphia to Trenton and from Philadelphia to the bay is aware of the fact that the territory from Philadelphia to the bay is one of the greatest industrial areas in all America. There is no reason whatever, except for the shallowness of the channel

from Philadelphia to Trenton, why that upper area of the river which is almost half as great in extent as the area I have described, will not equal in every way in importance, from an industrial point of view, the area along the lower stretch of the river.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in recognition of the importance of the port, during the 8-year period when my distinguished colleague was Governor and when I followed him as Governor, expended almost \$30 million in State funds so that one of the tributaries of the Delaware would not silt into the Delaware and interfere with navigation to the great port of Philadelphia.

If our State was willing to expend \$30 million of its own funds for that purpose, that fact alone ought to show the appraisal that the people of Pennsylvania attach to the importance of the port of Philadelphia.

If the United States Steel Co. were to be the only company that ever would have an installation in that great area from Philadelphia to Trenton there might be some point to the argument that they ought to contribute. However, by virtue of the very character of the area, its importance to the defense of this country and the magnificent development that has already taken place below Philadelphia, which positively will repeat itself in the upper river area, the argument loses persuasiveness, because the depth of the channel is the only thing that has so far inhibited the upper river from great development. Based merely on a dollars-and-cents viewpoint, considering the new income which would be available to the Government in the way of taxes as a result of the development that would take place in the upper river, such as has taken place in the lower river, it would be one of the best investments the Government could make.

I am sure a visual view of the area in question, below and above Philadelphia, would convince anyone of the fact that the channel alone is the one thing which has prevented the upper river from being developed in the manner in which the lower river has and the lower river is one of the greatest industrial areas of the world. Therefore, the United States Steel Co. should not be penalized for having the foresight to appreciate the value of this location in an area which, as my colleague pointed out, has within 100 miles 14 percent of the population of America, and within a radius of 300 miles, one-third of the whole population of America. By reason of fresh water facilities, location, and proximity to facilities and markets, and the fact that other factories will come into that area, as happened in the lower river, there is every reason to believe an equal amount of industry will come to the upper river once the channel is deepened.

Therefore, it would seem to me that, unless we were going to look only as far as the end of our noses, and if we are willing to take a look at the future, we must appreciate that this area in the region between Philadelphia and Trenton is bound to be one of the greatest

industrial areas of America. The improvement under discussion will immediately contribute to that result and speed that day.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—21

Anderson	Jackson	Mansfield
Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Goldwater	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Green	Kefauver	Pastore
Hennings	Kennedy	Russell
Hill	Kilgore	Smathers
Humphrey	Magnuson	Symington

NAYS—56

Alken	Ferguson	Millikin
Barrett	Frear	Morse
Beall	George	Mundt
Bennett	Gillette	Neely
Bowring	Hendrickson	Payne
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bush	Holland	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Reynolds
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Kerr	Saltonstall
Clements	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Crippa	Lehman	Stennis
Dirksen	Lennon	Thye
Duff	Long	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ellender	Martin	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	Eastland	McCarthy
Burke	Flanders	Sparkman
Byrd	Gore	Upton
Capehart	Hayden	Welker
Chavez	Jenner	Wiley
Daniel	Maybank	
Douglas	McCarran	

So the amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS) was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, because the time was controlled I was unable to present the statement I had intended to make on the pending bill, House bill 9859. Because of my interest in the particular amendment which has just been rejected, and because of my interest in the entire overall development of rivers and harbors, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. This statement clearly sets forth my convictions on the amendment which has just been rejected.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Two of the largest items in the bill (H. R. 9859) now pending to authorize construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control, are the authorizations of \$101 million for the inland waterway from the Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, which was approved by the House of Representatives, and an item of \$91 million for enlarged channel improvements in the Delaware River between Philadelphia and Trenton, which is embodied in an amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Public Works following the extensive hearings which that committee held with reference to all of these projects.

I intend to support the recommendations of the Public Works Committee with reference to these large authorizations because I believe that they are justified and the larger economic needs of the area to be served, and thus of the Nation as a whole, are such as to warrant this action.

It has been my feeling that we should consider these matters on the basis of the justification for them and the advantages and benefits that will result from such improvements.

It is only natural that the States immediately affected by such a large scale improvement program would have a primary interest in their development, but that interest is also the national interest.

Minnesota and the other upper Midwestern States have a primary interest in another important waterway development which is closely related to the St. Lawrence seaway development project already authorized by Congress and approved by the President.

It is extremely important that in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway there should be early authorization of the necessary public works to improve and deepen the upper channels of the Great Lakes for the full potential of this great development can only be realized if the project is carried out as a whole.

It is my hope that when the report of the Army engineers relative to the present survey being made as to the cost of the connecting channel in the upper Great Lakes is presented to Congress in the next session this improvement likewise will be authorized.

The Army engineers have advised me that the present study concerning the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes will be completed by the district and division engineers about November 1, after which their recommendations will be submitted to the Board for Rivers and Harbors and subsequently to the Public Works Committees of Congress.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I was glad to have had a part last year in the recommendation of that committee that approximately \$150,000 be made available to the Corps of Engineers for the present survey of the connecting channels.

Although no information has been made available by the Army engineers relative to their reappraisal of the proposed 27-foot channel in the Great Lakes, it is anticipated that the cost will be approximately \$125 million for these improvements.

When the bill was introduced early last year to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, I proposed an amendment to authorize an appropriation for such improvements as may be necessary to provide a deep waterway for navigation requiring a controlling channel depth of 27 feet through the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, including the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, St. Clair River, the Straits of Mackinac, and the St. Mary's River.

The proposed authorization of funds in this amendment was approximately the same as the estimate which had been made on the earlier survey of these channels.

It was proposed to spread the appropriation over a 5-year period as the engineers contemplated that it would require at least that length of time for the necessary planning, dredging, and construction.

It has always been my considered judgment that if the canal at the International Rapids section is built and the construction of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes is delayed or sidetracked this would result in injury to vital areas which have a great stake in this entire waterway

and would retard and diminish the economic returns for a large segment of our people.

In supporting the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation enactment, I did not press for the adoption of my amendment relating to the upper Great Lakes channels partly because I felt the bill then under consideration should be decided on its merits and also because I felt that Congress could act with greater understanding of the need if we had a new survey of the channel needs and a reappraisal of the specific requirements for that improvement.

I have always felt that even if no other part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway were ever undertaken, the deepening of the connecting channels in the upper Great Lakes would be essential and should be implemented at the earliest possible time for the full utilization of our greatest inland waterway.

It is obvious that to give lake ports on Huron, Superior, and Michigan the full benefit of the St. Lawrence seaway, which we know now is assured, the present program must be supplemented by deepening the channels that connect those lakes.

Under present plans the seaway is to provide a depth of 27 feet, and the upper lake channels must be brought to at least that future seaway depth both because failure to do so would prevent the greatest potential use of the entire waterway and also because the many new vessels which have been added to the Great Lakes fleet have drafts which require the deepening of these connecting channels.

In other words, interlake traffic alone would require a deepening of these channels to 27 feet.

Iron ore, limestone, coal, petroleum, and grain are the chief commodities moved on the Great Lakes.

It has been estimated that the tonnage on the Great Lakes approximates our total foreign waterborne commerce.

On a ton-mileage basis, it exceeds that on our inland waterways by 3.3 times and that by our motortrucks by 1.6 times.

Larger ships now operating on the Great Lakes or being planned for construction are designed to handle some 24,000 tons of ore, which is equivalent to a freight train of 480 cars, with each car loaded to 50 tons.

I think it is interesting to note that in the historic consideration of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence seaway project, the Great Lakes system has always included the five great Lakes of Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair.

Deep waterway has been defined in all the agreements between the United States and Canada as meaning a controlling channel depth of 27 feet from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal Harbor via the Great Lakes system and St. Lawrence River.

The upper channels have been considered essential links in the deep waterway.

What is involved so far as the national interest in this entire matter is concerned, is primarily the requirements in the shipment of iron ore.

Other important aspects involve shipments of grain, development of other low-cost freight shipment, and the working out of a balanced transportation system.

Improvement of the Great Lakes waterway system is an economic necessity for the future of the upper midwest areas and will be a resultant benefit to the entire country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is at the desk, proposed by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator from Colorado, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

The project for flood control and other purposes, on the Purgatoire (Picketwire) River, Colo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated July 22, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$17 million: *Provided*, That repayment of the first cost allocated to irrigation shall be made under the applicable Federal reclamation law.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Colorado and myself to H. R. 9859 would authorize the Purgatoire River project substantially in accordance with the recommendations made by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, in his report dated July 22, 1954.

The project contemplates the construction of a multiple-purpose reservoir about 4 miles above the city of Trinidad on the Purgatoire River. This project has been jointly planned by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior.

An earth-filled dam about 208 feet in height would be constructed. The reservoir would have a total storage capacity of 140,700 acre-feet of water apportioned as follows: Flood control, 46,700 acre-feet; conservation, 55,000 acre-feet; and sediment retention, 39,000 acre-feet.

The Purgatoire River project will provide flood protection for Trinidad, Colo., and nearby areas. I call attention to the serious floods which inundate large areas because there is not adequate control of the river at this time.

On July 23, 1954, the Purgatoire River overran its banks, endangering life and property. The river rose from 1.34 feet to 16 feet during the rainstorm and sheriff officers warned ranchers along the river south of La Junta and Las Animas to evacuate their homes.

I shall not read these newspaper clippings, but I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newspaper clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of July 24, 1954] —
UP TO 5 INCHES OF RAIN FLOODS SOUTHEAST AREAS

Parts of southeast Colorado along the Purgatoire River were digging out Saturday after cloudbursts in the preceding 48 hours dumped as much as 5 inches of rain in some locations.

Isolated for a time was Trinchera, 35 miles southeast of Trinidad, when floodwaters from the swollen Purgatoire washed out bridges along State Highway 55 both east and west of the small cattle community.

The swirling waters washed out sections of Colorado & Southern Railroad tracks in the region and work trains from Trinidad and Texline worked late Friday to repair the damage.

Heavy runoff flooded many homes in Trinchera and about 3 feet of water flowed through the railroad yard. Power lines and telephone service were disrupted for hours.

MILD FOR WEEKEND

All tributaries of the Arkansas River were reported running high, and some out of their banks, as flash floods followed cloudbursts late Friday. Many sections of low-lying

highway were covered for a time, but all were reported back in service in that region by Saturday morning.

Weathermen in Denver forecast mild weekend temperatures and partly cloudy skies. The 5-day forecast for the metropolitan area calls for high temperatures around 90 degrees and a few afternoon or evening thundershowers through Wednesday. Nights will be comfortable at 55 to 60 degrees, the weather bureau said.

Colorado during the same period is expected to have temperatures near seasonal or slightly warmer, and scattered showers and thunderstorms.

[From the Fort Morgan Times of July 23, 1954]

PURGATOIRE RIVER OUT OF ITS BANKS

The Purgatoire River was running out of its banks Friday, endangering ranch properties and livestock, after cloudbursts swept over southern Colorado late Thursday. The storms centered in the Trinidad area.

Sheriff officers warned ranchers along the Purgatoire, also known as the Picketwire, south of La Junta and Las Animas to evacuate their houses and move their livestock to higher ground.

At Las Animas the Purgatoire was carrying 18,000 second feet of water with a higher crest expected late Friday. The river rose from 1.34 feet to 16 feet early Friday. Between Trinidad and Higbee, where the greatest danger to livestock occurred, the river was carrying 57,000 second feet of water.

The river measuring device at Higbee was washed downstream by the flood.

More rain was reported falling Friday east of Higbee and Caddoa Creek. All tributaries to the Arkansas River in the area are high. More than 2 inches fell at Holly, near the Kansas line. Eads, 35 miles north, received only a drizzle.

The flood waters from the Purgatoire River will be impounded in the John Martin Reservoir, below Las Animas. The reservoir is dry at present.

The highway department reported the rains temporarily blocked several stretches of roads, but all were open Friday.

The storm damage centered at Trinchera, 35 miles southeast of here, several hundred yards of the Colorado & Southern Railway right-of-way were washed and trains were held at Trinidad and at points south of Trinchera until the tracks could be repaired.

Trinchera Creek overflowed its banks, inundating state 55 and the railroad tracks. At one time the water was 2 feet deep in the Trinchera depot.

Ranches in Frisco Canyon were reported damaged by heavy rainfall and overflowing creeks.

Rainfall at Trinidad totaled 1.42 inches. The recently dedicated Pinon Canyon Dam northwest of the city prevented damage to the northwest sections by controlling runoff. The Purgatoire River, which runs through Trinidad flowed within 2 feet of the top of its channel but there was no damage from it.

The rains brought small landslides onto the million-dollar highway—U. S. 550—between Ouray and the New Mexico border, closing the road briefly, the report said. It added it was still raining Friday in the area but the road was reopened.

U. S. 160 between Beshoar Junction and Kim, Colo., has up to 1 foot of water covering the road in several sections, the department said, although the road is still open.

Heavy rains washed out shoulders along State 61 north of Otis and State 51 north of Wray, with traffic moving slowing on both roads.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am informed that on past occasions—and during this storm, too—flood damage has disrupted

rail transportation when a rush of water has inundated or washed out sections of mainline tracks belonging to the Colorado & Southern Railway and the Santa Fe. These important western railroads connect Denver, Colo., and points within the State of Texas. I need not tell Senators what such a condition would mean during a period of emergency. There would be great disruption and delay of rail movements between the South and the Rocky Mountain area.

Construction of this project would result in benefits to the area through flood control and would make available an additional supply of irrigation water for thousands of acres within the project area. The need for irrigation water is keenly felt by those persons residing in areas with insufficient water. Water is the basic need of the agricultural economy of the area. This project, when completed, will supply the needed water, which will result in an expanded agricultural industrial community. I emphasize that existing storage and regulatory facilities on the Purgatoire River are inadequate for complete regulation of the available water supply to permit maximum crop utilization within the area.

The total first cost of the project is estimated to be \$17 million, with \$8,268,000 of this amount allocated to flood control, and \$8,732,000 allocated to irrigation. The cost of this project is small by comparison to the value of human life and property. I understand that each year the estimated cost of damage caused by floods in this area is \$226,700.

Local residents of the project area are interested in this project. They want the Trinidad Reservoir. They will repay to the Federal Government that portion of the estimated cost which is chargeable to irrigation. Their share will be \$8,732,000 of the total estimated first cost of \$17 million.

I ask for favorable consideration of this project, and for approval of this amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. My recollection on this point is that the project which the Senator proposes has a favorable cost-to-benefit ratio, but at the time the committee acted it did not have a report from the Bureau of the Budget or the Army engineers. For that reason the committee did not take action on the project. The committee thought the Senator from Colorado made an excellent argument in favor of the project.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator for the very friendly consideration which was given the project.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if the Purgatoire River is not a tributary of the Arkansas River, which flows through our State?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Purgatoire River is a tributary of the Arkansas River, which flows through our two States and is subject to a compact between the States of Colorado and Kansas. The compact prohibits any violation of its terms, and its terms would not be violated by the proposed action.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to assure him that we do not oppose the project, but I wish the record to show that Kansas has a direct interest in the proposed project. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Colorado, that the compact between the States of Colorado and Kansas will prevail, and that we shall be given consideration in connection with the amount of water to be stored in the reservoir, I shall not object. However, I think the RECORD should show that the Governor of Kansas was asked for his views on the project by the Corps of Army Engineers, and in a letter to the Engineers he opposed the project. If the distinguished Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to read an excerpt from the Governor's letter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. CARLSON. I shall read only the concluding paragraph of the letter written by Governor Arn concerning the Purgatoire River project.

Even the most conservative estimate indicates an increased depletion of Purgatoire River water. It is our conclusion that the operation of this project would, at times, materially deplete the water supply which would otherwise be available to Kansas water users through the John Martin Reservoir. Under these conditions, the State of Kansas at this time is opposed to the project as proposed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I believe my colleague will consent to the modification of the amendment so as to make it clear that the project will not be operated in any way which would interfere with the compact. I do not think such an amendment is necessary, because the language is already clear, to the effect that the compact must be complied with.

Mr. CARLSON. I am pleased to accept the statement of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. However, the people of Kansas might feel a little less uneasy if such an amendment were added to the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification of the pending amendment and ask that it be stated. I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague as a modification of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 7 of the original amendment it is proposed to add the following:

In the operation and maintenance of the facilities of this project authorized by this act, under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, in the Purgatoire River Basin, such officers are directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Arkansas River compact (63 Stat. 145).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Colorado tell us whether the proposed reservoir would cover up any places where dinosaurs once walked? If that were so, of course we should not approve the project.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Unhappily the dinosaurs did not leave any of their bones around there.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator assure us that dinosaurs did not walk through that part of his State?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know of any evidence to that effect.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator states that all kinds of animal life wandered through there in prehistoric times, he may be prejudicing his case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No claim is made that any dinosaurs or brontosaurus or any similar animals ever wandered through that part of Colorado. I would have to look up the facts before I could accurately answer the Senator's question, but I am perfectly willing to let my troubles rest as they are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have some telegrams in my hand, and I wonder whether they refer to the pending amendment or to the pending legislative proposal. The first telegram reads:

ST. PAUL, MINN., August 16, 1954.
Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota Conservation Federation urges blocking of move to add upper Colorado storage project as rider to omnibus flood-control bill. This project highly controversial from economic and national park invasion standpoint. Needs extension hearings and revision. We urge holding it for next Congress for adequate discussion on its own merits.

CLIFF SAKRY,
Executive Secretary, Minnesota
Conservation Federation.

Mr. THYE. The other telegram reads as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., August 16, 1954
Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Am advised upper Colorado storage project may become rider to omnibus flood-control bill. Sincerely hope you can block such move. Features of upper Colorado project too controversial from economic standpoint alone to be authorized in this manner. Needs extensive hearings and modifications to make it sound.

THOMAS R. EVANS.

Mr. THYE. Do those telegrams refer to the question before the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator not to have those telegrams placed in the RECORD. The project under consideration has nothing to do with the Upper Colorado River. The telegrams

refer to a matter on the other side of the Continental Divide, and to an entirely different stream system. We are concerned with the Arkansas River Basin. The two stream systems are divided by the Continental Divide. I suggest that the Senator not put those telegrams in the RECORD, because they would reflect on our geographical knowledge of the State of Colorado.

Mr. THYE. We in Minnesota are not acquainted with all the Rocky Mountains. In order that the RECORD may be clear, and in order that I may not be derelict in my responsibilities and duties, I ask whether the matters referred to in the telegrams refer to the project in question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Not in the slightest, remotest, or microscopic degree.

Mr. THYE. Then the question has been answered, and the telegrams have been answered. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I urge the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to ask his constituents to take a look at the geography of Colorado and to spend some part of the summer out there, where they can learn about this river system.

Mr. THYE. I would not encourage them to do so. If they are to spend any time away from home, I should prefer to have them spend it in northern Minnesota.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not blame them for that at all. I have been there myself.

Colorado is 1 mile nearer to heaven than most of the rest of the country. Some sinners—not around here, of course—will need that extra mile.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield further, I am happy to have brought up the question, because my question was answered properly. On the other hand, I regret having brought it up, because it produced a chamber of commerce speech by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Minnesota ought to hear a real chamber of commerce man from Colorado.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if there is anything in the report on this question? Is there any indication as to how much water would be diverted from the Arkansas River by this project? Is it any considerable amount?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe the project can be operated so that no water will be diverted from the Arkansas River. We have changed our amendment specifically—

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I appreciate that, but I was wondering if there was anything in the report with reference to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to yield a moment or two to my neighbor from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with my neighbor from the State of Colorado. I think the project which he has in mind has a great deal of merit.

What I wish to emphasize is that many people do not know the history of Colorado and New Mexico. Four hundred years ago, in the home State of the Senator from Colorado, around Pueblo, there was a land grant by Philip II of Spain involving a large piece of real estate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. History was being made there many years ago. It is not realized that in Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, or Arizona, a small amount of water means much to us. In the East people want to get rid of water. Out West we want to save what little there is. Whether the water be in Colorado or anywhere else out there, I think we should all realize that it is the life-blood of the people of the West.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I appreciate the Senator's contribution.

Mr. President, I should like to yield at this time to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled by the junior Senator from Colorado and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield some time to the senior Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the junior Senator from Colorado have time remaining?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have no time left.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it would be a great mistake to adopt this amendment in the race for adjournment. The problem was before the Public Works Committee where it was given very fair consideration, and the proposal was turned down. The cost-to-benefit ratio is exceedingly high. The project has not been fully cleared by all the departments involved.

I think a remarkably fine job has been done by the Public Works Committee in bringing the bill before the Senate. I think it is a very fair bill, and I think great credit is due the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the subcommittee, and the full committee, under their respective chairmanships. I think the project can well go over until January, when the Senators from Colorado and other interested Senators can try to convince the committee.

I hope the Senate will support the Public Works Committee and not approve this amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I oppose this project with great regret. My first reason for opposing it is this: This is a substitute project for one which was already authorized, which had a large public benefit-to-cost ratio and which would have cost only about a million dollars. The present estimated cost is something over \$2 million. It is a flood-control project channelized through the city of Trinidad, Colo. The substitution

of the \$17 million project itself offers a serious problem.

The second reason is that the committee requested the opinion of the Budget Bureau and was unable to get an approving opinion. One of the reasons was that the Bureau of the Budget had not received an answer from the Governor of Kansas which State was involved in the compact with Colorado.

The third reason is that when the Governor of Kansas acted, he acted unfavorably to the project.

I am completely willing to reconsider the matter on later hearings, and I hope we can get it into such shape that we can approve it at a later date. It was with regret that I felt I could not approve it when it was before our committee.

It seems to me that if we are going to proceed in an orderly fashion, when the committee finds itself confronted with almost insuperable obstacles, as it did, and turns the project down with great regret after having a most able exposition of the situation by the distinguished Senators from Colorado, the committee should stand its ground, because otherwise we are likely to be accused of having passed pork-barrel legislation.

I hope, for the three reasons I have indicated, and for the additional reason that the benefit-to-cost ratio is only 1.07, that we will allow this matter to be further studied by a sympathetic committee which hopes it can act favorably on it at some future date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The junior Senator from Colorado offered two amendments. Does he not have time on each of those amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will my colleague yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I yield the senior Senator from Colorado 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the project which we have proposed tonight is one which has been studied very carefully by the Army Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation. There was some argument about improving the channel of the river through the city of Trinidad. That would have cost less money, but, Mr. President, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has pointed out, water is very precious in that arid part of the West and in the area about which we are speaking tonight. We cannot afford to widen the channel and let that water go on down the river. We want to conserve it to the greatest possible extent.

Half of this project is for flood control, and half of it is for reclamation. Half of the cost will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States, and half of it, of course, is dedicated to flood control.

The Army engineers reported the project on July 22, and, strangely

enough, a flood occurred on July 23, the day following their report. There have been many floods in the past; in fact, they occur possibly two or three times a year, and some of those floods have cost a considerable amount of money because they do great damage to the city of Trinidad.

This is not pork-barrel legislation; it is an investment in America. America is worthy of that kind of investment. America is what she is today because of such investments. This project would be an investment in America. Half of the investment would be repaid in different ways by citizens of Colorado, who are subject to the floods.

The question was asked by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] whether any water would be diverted from the Arkansas River Basin by the project. The answer is that not one drop would be diverted from the Arkansas Basin. The rights of Kansas are protected, as my colleague has said, by the compact which has been entered into between Kansas and Colorado and ratified by Congress. Congress has no power or authority to pass any laws to take, use, or allocate any of that water which are not in accord with that very sacred treaty—which is what it is—between the States of Kansas and Colorado. That matter has been taken care of by the amendment which has been proposed and which, I understand, was accepted as a perfecting amendment to the original amendment which was offered.

I sincerely hope the very able chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] will find it possible to take the proposed amendment to conference, because this proposal is one of very great merit. I doubt whether there are any projects in the whole bill which equal this project so far as merit is concerned.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that to adopt this amendment would cause the Senate to be accused of pork barrel legislation. I have glanced through the bill and have noticed that 37 States of the Union and two Territories are receiving projects and benefits in the bill. That is not pork barrel legislation. I believe that every one of the projects in the 37 States and 2 Territories is an investment in the United States of America. They are all good investments, which will repay to the Treasury many times their cost.

I hope the Senators in charge of the bill will find it within their hearts and consciences to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no one to whom I am more devoted or whom I admire more than I do the two Senators from Colorado. Notwithstanding his Republicanism, I still have the greatest respect for the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I know of the devotion of the distinguished

senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to the people of his State.

If there is one particular area that I know about, next to New Mexico, it is the area around Trinidad, about which the Senators from Colorado have been speaking. But, after all, we owe a duty to the chairmen of our committees. I think the amendment has much merit, but it should not be included in this bill. I believe it should be discussed further. The committee went through the list of public works, in order, after 4 years, to try to draft a good bill. It is true that the bill contains projects for 37 States. Why not? Why not have projects in Massachusetts, Oregon, Colorado, or New Mexico? But I think we are duty bound to be fair with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who worked hard and patiently for many months in order to report a good bill, and we should support him.

I should like to join with my two colleagues from Colorado, because I know the river. I walked that river probably before they were even in Colorado. The project which they are seeking has much merit, but it does not belong in this bill. I want to help them. If they will introduce a bill making this a separate project, and hearings are held on it, I believe the necessity of constructing it can be proved to Congress. But in this particular instance, I think the Committee on Public Works should be sustained.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Perhaps I should have said more about the conditions in the particular area of the project. Trinidad once was a great coal-producing region. The coal business has disappeared there. People are out of work. The community is in a poor condition. Floods recur from time to time, and the industry is unable to function. The floods are tearing up the town and tearing up the good land outside of the town.

There is not time to make a long study. This is not a new project. Various phases of the project have been before Congress for a long time.

The people in that region are being afflicted with floods. The basic industry of the region is demoralized, and the land is being washed out as a result of floods. The people cannot wait. Let us help them by getting the project started while there is time to do some good.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I feel very unhappy about this situation, because the two highly distinguished Senators from Colorado have made such a strong appeal for the adoption of their amendment. I have no doubt in my mind that they speak with the greatest sincerity when they say that the improvement is needed by the people in that region.

But I am bound to support the comments of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOL-

LAND]. I am the one who proposed to the committee that the bill should include projects with respect to which the committee did not have favorable reports from the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. We do not have such reports yet on this particular project. As chairman of the subcommittee, having asked the committee to adopt such a policy, I find myself in a most unenviable position—nevertheless, one in which I must recommend that the amendment not be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did not an Army officer attend the hearings on the bill, and did he not indicate that the Corps of Engineers had approved the project? As I recall, an Army engineer appeared and testified with respect to the bill. He testified at length and answered all the questions of the committee.

I am certain the Army engineers have recommended the project. The Army sent its recommendations to the committee on July 22. Therefore, I am certain that, at long last, the project has been recommended.

Mr. BUSH. The comment of the Senator is that an Army engineer told him that a report had been filed by the Bureau of the Budget. We do not have the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] for himself and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

The purpose of the amendment which I offer for myself and my colleague, Senator CLEMENTS, is to direct the Corps of Engineers to make an examination and survey of the Big Sandy River and its Tug and Levisa Forks in Kentucky and West Virginia and Virginia, and to review its latest report dated March 15, 1950, with a view to revising the estimated costs and benefits contained in the report, to reflect present conditions. It is our desire that the Corps of Engineers will not be required to restrict itself to its recommendation contained in this latest report for the development of these rivers, but will seek

such a plan of development as will be appropriate for navigation, flood control, and power development as will meet the demands of the area and be economically feasible.

On January 9, 1953, I introduced for myself and my colleague, Senator CLEMENTS, a bill (S. 279) to authorize the construction of public works for navigation, flood control and power development on the Big Sandy and its tributaries. It would have effectively canalized the Big Sandy River.

In 1953, hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Senator BUSH. Many people representing business, agriculture and labor of the area testified before the committee in favor of the approval of S. 279. At the hearing the representatives of the Corps of Engineers testified that their last report dated March 15, 1950, showed that the benefits that would be derived from the improvements on the Big Sandy would not equal the costs of its development and that under their policy they recommended against the construction of locks and dams on the rivers.

Later, Senator CLEMENTS and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Public Works and asked that our bill be approved by the committee and that the authorization of the new locks and dams on the Big Sandy and its forks be included in S. —, which is now before us. The committee gave us a very full hearing, but stated that because of the unfavorable report of the Corps of Engineers they could not under their policy include it in the pending bill. The committee suggested that an authorization should be obtained to direct the Corps of Engineers to make a new examination to see if new factors and conditions had changed the cost-benefit ratio. That is the purpose of our amendment.

I point out to the Senate that in 1948 the Corps of Engineers reported that the benefits from this project would exceed the cost, but in 1952 the cost of the project had increased from approximately \$85 million to over \$161 million. We submit that this increase in cost arose chiefly from the inflationary price advances caused by the Korean war.

We suggest that the following factors, among others, ought to be considered now by the Corps of Engineers:

1. That a reduction in cost of materials and other factors connected with construction, has occurred since the close of the Korean war.

2. There may be a reduction of cost in the project due to the approved construction of a high-level dam on the Ohio River near Greenup, Ky. The Congress has just appropriated funds to begin the construction of this dam. This dam will back water up the Big Sandy almost to the second lock and dam and will thus begin its canalization. This should reduce the total cost of the Big Sandy project.

3. Additional benefits have occurred since the submission of the last report to the Congress. Among them I name the following:

Several steam plants are now in construction along the Ohio River to supply the atomic energy plants at Paducah, Ky., and Piketon, Ohio. This will undoubtedly provide a larger market for coal from the Big Sandy Valley.

Also, rail freight rates have increased measurably in the last several years and the cheaper water transportation should be considered in the estimates of benefits.

There are other factors, of course, to be considered, but I name these as examples. Previously, at my request, the Corps of Engineers has been directed to make a survey of reservoir sites on the Big Sandy and its tributaries for the purpose of selecting a site which is economically feasible. Authorizations for reservoirs had been made under the act of 1938 and later, but had been found

by the Corps of Engineers to have an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio, and nothing had been done to survey other sites. Now the Corps of Engineers has been directed to review, for the purpose of determining a site which will be justified under the cost-benefit ratio rule, so that we may go ahead with requests for appropriations for reservoirs.

The Big Sandy Valley holds a store of great resources in coal, timber, gas and oil, and other products unmatched in the Nation. These products cannot flow to the market as they should without cheaper transportation. The development and canalization of the Big Sandy Valley will provide cheaper navigation, flood control, reservoirs, and volume of water in the river for industry and recreation. My colleague, Senator CLEMENTS, and I submit this amendment so that the Corps of Engineers will immediately make this survey in order that my colleague and I may present these new factors which I have mentioned to the Senate at an early date, so that this great project may be favorably considered and approved. I move the adoption of our amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania is willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the junior Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—77

Alken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Green	McCarran
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Cooper	Kefauver	Reynolds
Cordon	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Crippa	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smathers
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Langer	Stennis
Ervin	Lehman	Symington
Ferguson	Lennon	Thye
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Malone	Young
Gillette	Mansfield	

NAYS—2

Robertson Russell

NOT VOTING—17

Bridges	Eastland	McCarthy
Burke	Flanders	Sparkman
Byrd	Gore	Upton
Capehart	Hayden	Welker
Daniel	Jenner	Wiley
Douglas	Maybank	

So the bill (H. R. 9859) was passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair) appointed Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. HOLLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to make any technical and typographical corrections which may be found necessary in the bill, as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GOLDWATER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this evening.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3706) to outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REED of Illinois, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9680) to provide for the continued price support for agricultural products; to augment the marketing and disposal of such products; to provide for greater stability in agriculture; and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 34, 54, 55, 59, 72, 73, 93, 103, 105, 113, 114, 126, 152, 159, and 169 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 27, 30, 31, 38, 39, 40, 46, 49, 52, 56, 61, 62, 71½, 74, 79, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 99, 100, 104, 110, 115, 116, 119, 122, 127, 128, 129, 132, 134, 136, 147, 148, 151, 154, 155, 164, 168, and 187 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60, 71, and 130.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of

State, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FRINGE EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—CON- FERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has ready for submission a conference report which I understand has been agreed to by all the conferees. The distinguished ranking minority member of the committee is present at this time. The presentation of this matter has been postponed until now, in order that both those Senators might be present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2263) to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1954, pp. 13893-13896, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this conference report is on what is known as the fringe employment benefits bill. The conference report is a unanimous report on the part of all the conferees, and it is signed by all the conferees for both the House and the Senate.

The report makes only a few changes. Generally speaking, the Senate version of the bill is approved. On 2 or 3 occasions the Senate voted for repeal of the so-called Whitten rider. The conferees agreed to a rewriting of the Whitten rider. It was rewritten on a basis that had at least the consent and approval of the Civil Service Commission. In other words, the Commission had not changed its view that it wished the rider repealed, but said it could live under the provisions the conferees adopted.

The conference report makes 1 or 2 changes in the provisions regarding overtime pay. It provides for full time and one-half through the minimum rate for grade 9.

Mr. President, let me say by way of summary of the conference report that the Senate version of the bill provided for full time and one-half overtime pay up through the maximum rate for grade 9. The conference agreement provides for full time and one-half through the minimum rate for grade 9.

The Senate version provided that overtime pay could not be less than straight time. The conference agreement omits this provision.

The Senate version excluded fire fighters from the category of employees who

may be paid 25-percent premium compensation in lieu of overtime pay for irregular overtime. The conference agreement eliminates this exclusion.

The Senate version contained no limit on incentive awards payable under the bill. The conferees added a \$5,000 limit generally, with a provision under which awards up to \$25,000 could be made with the approval of the Civil Service Commission in special cases.

The Senate version provided that up to \$100 per annum could be paid to employees required to wear uniforms, to assist in defraying the cost of acquisition or upkeep of their uniforms. The conference agreement eliminates reference to upkeep; and also provides that the head of the department may furnish uniforms in lieu of paying the uniform allowance.

The Senate version repealed the Whitten rider. The conference agreement modifies, but does not repeal, this provision. Under the modification, permanent appointments could be made up to 10 percent above the total number of employees employed on September 1, 1950. In addition, it authorizes permanent reinstatements and promotions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FAMILY QUARTERS FOR PERSON- NEL OF MILITARY DEPART- MENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is prepared to submit the conference report on House bill 9924, relating to military family housing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The conference report is signed by all the conferees; is it not?

Mr. CASE. Yes; the report is signed by all the conferees on behalf of both the House and the Senate.

There was only one principal item of controversy or discussion in the conference, and it related to the amount of for-

eign currencies which might be used in the acquisition of housing overseas. In the conference report, the amount of foreign currencies which may be used for the procurement of military housing overseas is reduced from \$75 million to \$25 million. Some of the conferees felt that since this was an experimental program or at least a new departure, the smaller amount should be used initially.

Furthermore, the language agreed to by the conferees authorizes the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of foreign currencies used in any fiscal year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the conference report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

H. R. 9924 TO PROVIDE FOR FAMILY QUARTERS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

The principal item on which the Houses disagreed was the Senate provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to procure family housing in foreign countries in the amount of \$75 million by using foreign currencies acquired through the sale of surplus agricultural commodities as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.).

Paragraph 3 of section 407 of the Senate bill provided that appropriations for quarters allowances for personnel occupying family housing procured in this manner would be available for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the foreign currencies used. This provision contemplated an annual transfer of appropriations that otherwise would be available for the payment of quarters allowances to personnel occupying the housing until the Commodity Credit Corporation had received full reimbursement for the currencies that had been acquired by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The House position was that there should be authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to be reimbursed within the period of the fiscal year in which the foreign currencies were used for the procurement of housing in an amount equivalent to the total dollar value of the currencies used.

The language agreed to in conference authorizes the transfer of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances to the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of foreign currencies used in any fiscal year. The extent of the authority for the procurement of family housing in foreign countries through the use of funds acquired by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities was reduced from \$75 million to \$25 million.

The compromise language relative to the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation presupposes the existence of unexpended balances of appropriations for quarters allowances. Since the extent of the monetary authorization for this purpose was reduced to \$25 million, the conferees have reason to believe that unexpended balances in this amount will be available for the purpose of reimbursement in full to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If this method of procuring family housing in foreign countries proves feasible, and the Congress in future years should decide to

alien sheepherders (p. 14245).

10. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 5499, authorizing the Michaud Flats project, Idaho (p. 14239). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Passed with amendments H. R. 2235, to authorize the Santa Maria project, Calif. Rejected, 17-47, an amendment by Sen. Morse eliminating the provision making an exception as to the 160-acre limitation in this project. (pp. 14286-8, 14290-304.)

River

S. 1555, to authorize the upper Colo./project, was made the unfinished business (p. 14304).

11. EDUCATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 3628, to provide a permanent program of assistance for school construction (p. 14262). This bill will now be sent to the President.

12. WATER COMPACT. Passed with amendments S. 2821, consenting to a compact among States for disposition of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries (pp. 14239-40, 14284-6).

13. NOMINATION of Herbert Hoover, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State, was confirmed (p. 14207).

14. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS. Discussed and, on objection of Sen. Smathers, passed over S. 3067, to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the U. S., be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after execution thereof (pp. 14241-2).

15. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Langer explained why he was absent during the vote on the conference report on H. R. 9680, the farm program bill, and said he would have voted against the report (p. 14223).

16. FARM PROGRAM; ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Goldwater, in discussing some of the dangers confronting our economic system, criticized high rigid price supports and stated that the administration has taken a "very courageous and long needed step in the farm program," and Sen. Kefauver suggested these 3 factors to reduce agricultural surpluses: Increase employment to enlarge purchasing power, improve the school-lunch program, and lower tariffs (pp. 14209-13).

HOUSE

17. FLOOD CONTROL. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 9859, the omnibus flood-control bill, which includes a provision authorizing 20,000,000 additional to this Department for work on watersheds (pp. 14175-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.

18. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2263, the fringe-benefits personnel bill (pp. 14172-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 9909, to prohibit payment of Government retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses. The amendment extends from 3 to 5 years the statute of limitations on certain crimes. (pp. 14174-5.) This bill will now be sent to the President.

Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 9709, to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, which includes a provision extending it to Federal employees (p. 14197). This bill will now be sent to the President.

19. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9924, to provide for family housing for military personnel and their dependents, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to procure such housing for military personnel in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies obtained through sale of surplus agricultural commodities, and to make Defense Department appropriations available to reimburse CCC in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the currencies used (p. 14175). This bill will now be sent to the President.
20. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1955. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees agreed to file a conference report on this bill, H. R. 10051, and that: "As agreed by the conferees the bill would provide total new funds of \$2,781,499,816, a decrease from the Senate- and House-passed versions of \$9,325,000 and \$114,445,184, respectively. The figure agreed upon added to unobligated funds of \$2,462,075,979 would make a grand total of \$5,243,575,795. (p. D1004).
21. RECLAMATION. Vacated the proceedings of Aug. 17 whereby H. R. 8498, to authorize the Palo Verde project, Calif., was sent to conference, and concurred in the Senate amendments to the bill (pp. 14171-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
22. DROUGHT RELIEF. Rep. Brown (Ga.) urged that Ga. be declared a major disaster area and stated that in more than 100 counties the grain crop is "practically destroyed" (p. 14178).
23. ADVISORY COMMITTEES; PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. Polk criticized the agricultural advisory committees and claimed that "almost none" of the reductions in prices received by farmers are being passed on to the consumers (pp. 14193-7).
24. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Eberharter spoke in favor of his bill, H. R. 9703, to provide assistance to communities, business enterprises and individuals in order to facilitate the adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the U. S. (pp. 14190-1).
25. DROUGHT RELIEF. The Legislative Reporting Staff has obtained a supply of a House Agriculture Committee print, "The Drought Program, an Explanation of the Government's Program, in Cooperation with the States and Individual Farmers, to Combat the Effects of Drought."

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill commending the Small Business Administration and stating that it is "assisting our National economy to grow stronger and to stabilize our home-owned-and-operated business firms" (pp. A6131-2).
27. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burdick criticizing the administration's farm program and stating that "the acreage cut which Benson has made will put many small farms out of business" (p. A6135).
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill discussing "the present situation of agriculture" and giving a brief report on the farm bill (pp. A6139-40).

victed of certain offenses, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 10, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 10. (a) Section 3282 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'three' and inserting in lieu thereof 'five'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to offenses (1) committed on or after the date of enactment of this act, or (2) committed prior to such date, if on such date prosecution therefor is not barred by provisions of law in effect prior to such date."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] if the amendment to the bill as passed by the House affects the annuities of those persons who are already receiving annuities or does it affect the annuities of those which have been granted Presidential pardons?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The answer to both questions is categorically no.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 17, 1954.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF GAVINS POINT RESERVOIR BACK OF GAVINS POINT DAM TO LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3744) to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam, which is located on the Missouri River near Yankton, S. Dak., shall hereafter be known as Lewis and Clark Lake and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under the name of Gavins Point Reservoir shall be held to refer to such body of water under and by the name of Lewis and Clark Lake.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION FOR THE ENLARGING OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1042) to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, created by the act of April 11, 1928 (45 Stat. 420), having fully executed all the duties imposed upon it by law, accomplished the purposes for which it was created, settled all accounts, and submitted its final report to Congress, is hereby dissolved and the members of such Commission discharged from any further duties in connection with the matters heretofore committed by law to such Commission.

SEC. 2. Any revocable permits now in effect, heretofore granted by the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds, to owners of properties adjacent to the Capitol Grounds, for construction, maintenance and use of walkways, approaches, or driveways in the Capitol Grounds, providing access to such properties from the Capitol Grounds, subject to revocation by such Commission or by the Architect of the Capitol, shall continue in effect, subject to revocation by the Architect of the Capitol under the direction and approval of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized hereafter to grant similar revocable permits to the owners of any properties adjacent to the Capitol Grounds whenever such action is deemed necessary to provide proper access to such properties from the Capitol Grounds; and such permits shall be in the form of an agreement saving the United States harmless from and against any and all claims of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of such permits, and containing such other provisions and conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may deem necessary or proper.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN PUBLIC-USE TERMINAL PROPERTIES NOW OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170 to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress, pursuant to section 4 (k) (b) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (55 Stat. 599-600; 16 U. S. C. 831c (k) (b)), hereby approves the conveyance of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the name of the United States, by deed, lease, or otherwise, for the purposes of said section 4 (k) (b) and on the basis of the fair sale or rental value determined by the Tennessee Valley Authority, of the public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States and in the custody of the Tennessee Valley Authority at Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Harriman, Tenn., and Decatur and Gunterville, Ala.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, after line 9, insert:

"Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del.: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document No. 358, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$91,389,000."

Page 6, after line 20, insert:

"The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor, N. C., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 87, 81st Congress, is hereby further modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project modification adopted in said act, provided that such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$65,000."

Page 6, after line 20, insert:

"Charleston Harbor, S. C.: Senate Document No. 136, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$200,000."

Page 7, after line 7, insert:

"Carrabelle Harbor, Fla.: House Document No. 451, 83d Congress (maintenance of existing channel)."

Page 7, after line 22, insert:

"Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.: Modification of existing project in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000."

Page 8, after line 19, insert:

"Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex.: House Document No. 487, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$180,000."

Page 9, line 12, after "approved", insert: "Provided, That such authorization shall include the acquisition of lands necessary for wildlife purposes as outlined in said Senate Document No. 81."

Page 10, after line 11, insert:

"Saginaw River, Mich.: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,496,800."

Page 10, after line 13, insert:

"Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document No. 486, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000."

Page 11, after line 24, insert:

"Richmond Harbor, Calif.: House Document No. 395, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,086,000."

Page 12, after line 5, insert:

"Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.: Senate Document No. 128, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,500,000."

Page 12, lines 19 and 20, strike out "House Document No. —, 83d Congress" and insert "In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954."

Page 13, after line 11, insert:

"Tacoma Harbor, Wash.: Modification of existing project to provide for 30-foot channel in Port Industrial (Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$634,200."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document No. 414, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Petersburg Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$40,000."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Pelican Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$270,000."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Ketchikan Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$2,947,900."

Page 13, after line 20, insert:

"Rocky Pass in Keku Strait, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$214,000."

Page 13, after line 24, insert:

"Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 465, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,685,000."

Page 14, after line 3, insert:

"Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, T. H.: House Document No. 453, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400."

Page 15, line 24, strike out "\$1,176,400" and insert "\$1,180,400."

Page 17, strike out lines 13 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause pre-

liminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities, and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland, Maine;

"Southwest Harbor, Maine;

"Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine;

"Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Fla., in the vicinity of Point Washington;

"Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Fla., to determine the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective measures with respect thereto; and

"Chipola River, Fla., for measures to maintain satisfactory water levels in the Dead Lakes;

"Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia."

Page 18, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 105. The authorization of the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River (H. Doc. No. 371, 75th Cong.) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and Lemon Bay, Fla., area, as designated in plans of the Corps of Engineers.

"The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Congress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of local contribution in the light of the changed condition. Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommendations shall become effective when approved by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives."

Page 18, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 106. That the requirement, that local interests provide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and harbor project authorized by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Miss., below Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: *Provided*, That local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will hold and save the United States free from any claim for damage which might result from deprivation of access to the area."

Page 18, line 10, strike out "105" and insert "107."

Page 21, after line 18, insert:

"The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pa., and N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25 million for partial accomplishment of that plan."

Page 23, line 7, strike out "as concurred in by" and insert "and."

Page 23, line 8, strike out "dated April 8, 1954" and insert "in House Document No. 478, 83d Congress."

Page 24, after line 18, insert:

"(e) The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake area, Tennessee and Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100."

Page 24, after line 18, insert:

"Trinity River Basin, Tex.

"The project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Tex., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 28, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,969,000."

Page 25, after line 10, insert:

"The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby modified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of 12,000 acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations."

Page 28, line 9, strike out "under section 2."

Page 28, after line 23, insert:

"Pecos River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Pecos River, Texas and New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: *Provided*, That no appropriations shall be made for construction of Los Esteros Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage from the Alamogordo Reservoir."

Page 30, after line 3, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Conway County Drainage and Levee District No. 1, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 167, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$230,600."

Page 30, after line 3, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Holla Bend Bottom, Ark., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 157, 82d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$312,000."

Page 30, after line 10, insert:

"The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Hannibal, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000."

Page 33, after line 9, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$3,430,000."

Page 33, after line 15, insert:

"The general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, 78th Congress, 2d session, approved in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers for construction or provision of adequate water supply and sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pollock, S. Dak., at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities in the town which are located within areas which have been or will be acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the basin."

Page 33, after line 21, insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart River in the vicinity of Mandan, N. Dak., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$1,727,000."

Page 34, lines 12 and 13, strike out "House Document No. —, 83d Congress" and insert "his report dated June 23, 1954."

Page 34, lines 21 and 22, strike out "House Document No. —, 83d Congress" and insert "said document."

Page 35, after line 19, insert:

"Santa Maria River Basin"

"The project for flood protection on Santa Maria River and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 400, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,182,000 for levees and channel improvements to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers."

Page 35, after line 19, insert:

"San Lorenzo River Basin"

"The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo River, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 447, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,665,000."

Page 36, after line 12, insert:

"San Lorenzo Creek Basin"

"The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo Creek, Alameda County, Calif., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 452, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,790,000."

Page 36, after line 12, insert:

"Truckee River Basin"

"The project for flood protection on Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$791,000: *Provided*, That the authorization for improvement for flood control on Truckee River, California and Nevada, contained herein shall not become effective unless and until the 'Washoe Reclamation Project' on the Truckee and Carson Rivers, California and Nevada, shall have been authorized pursuant to law."

Page 37, after line 2, insert:

"The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at Eugene and vicinity, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document No. 131, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of \$893,600."

Page 38, line 8, strike out "harbor" and insert "stream."

Page 38, line 9, strike out "title" and insert "section."

Page 38, after line 12, insert:

"Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Connecticut."

Page 38, after line 15, insert:

"Devils River and tributaries, Texas."

Page 38, after line 15, insert:

"Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL CANCELING STAMP "PRAY FOR PEACE"

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9120) to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special can-

celing stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "Pray for peace."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to grant permission to use special canceling stamps or postmarking dies," approved May 11, 1922 (39 U. S. C., sec. 368), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Any permission granted by the Postmaster General under the first section of this act shall be revocable in the event the Government shall find it expedient or necessary to use special canceling stamps or postmarking dies for its own purposes.

"(b) The Postmaster General is authorized to provide for the use in each first- and second-class post office, of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words 'Pray for peace.'"

SEC. 2. The second proviso in the first section of such act of May 11, 1922, is amended by striking out "nothing in this act" and inserting in lieu thereof "nothing in this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE SHEEPHERDERS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2074) for the relief of certain Basque sheepherders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman explain the purpose of this bill? Did I understand the gentleman to say it was for the relief of certain sheepherders?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a bill introduced in the other body by Senator WELKER and refers to 44 Basque sheepherders who are now in this country. This provides on a temporary suspension of their deportation. They are helping certain ranchers through this season. Then it is to be determined whether they are to be allowed to remain here or deported.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I understand that this bill provides that there shall be no deportation order against certain Basque sheepherders who came into this country as seamen; am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Despite the fact that they came in as seamen and remained here beyond their legal stay and therefore became deserting seamen, they subsequently became sheepherders, and

now we are going to allow them to remain in this country; is that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because there is need for their services and they are here.

Mr. CELLER. I have had no opportunity to investigate, but I have been told that there is a dearth of sheepherders in western grazing lands, and in view of that fact, I am not going to object. This bill is different from the bill that originally came before the Committee on the Judiciary; am I correct in that?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a committee amendment that will be offered.

Mr. CELLER. But, as I understand it, originally the bill provided that the number of sheepherders who are in this country and whose stay is legalized by this bill would not be—I do not know—subtracted from the Spanish quota. Could the gentleman enlighten me on that?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not granting these men citizenship.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say anything about citizenship. I said that we would allow them to remain here, but would those numbers be deducted from the Spanish quota?

Mr. GRAHAM. If, in the future, we granted permanent residence, those numbers would be deducted. But this bill does not grant permanent residence. It has only to do with a stay of the order of deportation.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, this bill does not grant them permanent residence; is that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I trust that it will be possible to adjust the status of these people permanently. After all, they have severed all of their ties in Spain and have established themselves here in an essential industry, engaged in a noncompetitive occupation—the herding of sheep. It is understood that the employment service is not able to meet the demands for skilled sheepherders. The retention of persons having special skills contributing thus vitally to our need for accelerated wool production is certainly in the public interest.

I am presently giving serious consideration to the possibility of a need for greater flexibility in the law to permit adjustment of status in worthy cases without resorting to private legislation of this nature. It seems to me that in all equity and justice at some future date these people should be permitted to remain in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cristobal Aguirre-Estivez, Martin Abaunza-Bilbao, Antolin Alvarez Valladares, Jose Antonio Alonso Goicoechea, Felix Arego-Arrien, Telesforo Arronte-Maza, Gregorio Artardi

Alberdi, Jose Luis Barrenechea-Madarieta, Damaso Beascochea Exposito, Nicolas Maria Beristain Piquer, Jose Bidasola-Gavica, Pablo Echevarria Monasterio, Donato Ecoreca Yturbe, Ygnacio Elguren Gabiola, Evaristo Fortuny-Alvarez, Florencio Garteiz-Elguren, Jesus Golcochea, Manuel Lopez Gonzalez, Ignacio Maria Gorricho-Agullre, Victoriano Guezuraga Enzunsu, Vincente Yblinnarriaga-Lopategui, Antonio Iglesias-Fernandez, Juan Isasi-Legarreta, Jose Iturri Guerequiz, Enrique Iazguirre-Iturbe, Luie Maria Izaguirre-Larranaga, Jayo Sabino-Guisasola, Santiago Juanche Oroz, Jesus Leceaga-Inchaurre, Ignacio Lecue-Larrauri, Doroteo Madariaga Otegui, Martin Madarieta-Arregui, Eusebio Mendiola Ycaran, Felix Mirandona-Zabala, Savino Navarro Arriaga, Marcelino Ormaechea-Lamiquiz, Genaro Ortuando-Barrena, Juan Prada Ramos, Marcelino Uriarte-Cearreta, Francisco Uribe Asteinza, Pedro Urruchurtu Urrutia, Felix Urteaga Berrio, Jose Antonio Zabala Asla and Tomas Francisco Zuazua Porturas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent resident as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent resident to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of line 3.

On page 1, line 4, strike out the word "act," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrests, and bonds which may have been issued in the cases of the following aliens."

On page 2, at the end of line 13, insert a "period."

On page 2, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"From and after the date of enactment of this act, these aliens shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDING OF MESSAGES OF GOOD WILL

(Mr. JONAS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am today presenting to the Library of Congress, for permanent safe keeping and future reference, this very interesting record which I hold in my hand.

This record was flown around the world in 1938—to our neighbors in the Americas, to the islands of the Pacific, and to the remote lands of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Wherever man's wings would carry him, this message of greeting and good will was dispatched with swiftness and safety, the dominant characteristic of our airmail service which

is without peer in all the world. When it was returned home again it contained similar messages to our people from the representatives of many countries around the world.

This project was conceived and organized by Mr. Charles H. Crutchfield, executive vice president and general manager of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., operator of radio station WBT and television station WBTV in Charlotte, N. C.

In 1938 Col. Paul Younts was postmaster of the city of Charlotte, N. C. He was selected by Postmaster General James A. Farley as executive chairman of the national committee to stage an observance of National Airmail Week. In setting up his committees to handle this celebration, Colonel Younts named Mr. Crutchfield as his national radio chairman. Mr. Crutchfield conceived the idea of flying this record around the world, and recording on it the messages of good will to which I have heretofore referred, and with the aid of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, now president of Eastern Air Lines, carried it through to a successful conclusion.

This recording contains such tangible expressions of good will, reflecting the friendship of the peoples of the world in a common bond of brotherhood, that I feel it should be preserved for posterity. The recording has been in the possession of Mr. Crutchfield since 1938 and he has turned it over to me with the suggestion that I present it, on behalf of the American people, to the Library of Congress.

The recording of the voices of the men of many nations and races from the far-flung places of the world, all speaking in terms of friendship and cooperation, signifies the desire of men to live together in peace and harmony. It is a symbol of friendship, of man's indomitable courage in his conquest of the air, and of faith that the good will which was recorded on this record 16 years ago may bring about an enduring peace in our time.

GEORGIA IS A MAJOR DISASTER AREA

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia delegation in Congress, the Governor, and many prominent citizens are doing their best to have the State of Georgia declared a major disaster area. Up to this time we have not been able to succeed.

In more than 100 counties of Georgia the grain crop is practically destroyed. In many areas they will make less than a bushel of corn per acre. The pastures are ruined. The people with cattle have no feed and are compelled to sell the stock at disastrously low prices.

Besides the great loss to the dairy farmers and cattle growers, cotton and other crops are a total loss in many areas, and in many other sections will run from 50 to 100 percent loss.

In one of the cities in the district which I have the honor to represent the water supply is so low that the city offi-

cials are seriously considering a complete shutdown of water service during certain hours of the day as a necessary conservation measure.

In many sections of the State this is the third drought year which has ruined many of the farmers. If the farmers in these areas are unable to get assistance they will be forced to give up their farms and seek employment elsewhere.

Evidence of the need for assistance in my State was furnished by a recent survey made by Hon. R. L. Vansant, State director of the Farmers' Home Administration. He reported that at least 110 Georgia counties should be declared drought-disaster areas because of acute feed shortages.

A blunt refusal to give aid, in view of the evidence of need, is not enough to satisfy the farmers with burnt-up crops, hungry cattle, and debts which they cannot pay.

If Georgia is not entitled to be designated as a major disaster area, then I am sure I do not understand what the law means. We cannot understand why some of the States have been declared disaster areas, and yet none of them have suffered the loss that the Georgia farmers have suffered. All we want is justice and equality with other States and communities, and if we cannot get this, why have the law?

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, because of the confidence and dependence that many of us place in the printed word, and because the U. S. News & World Report is usually so accurate, I would like to call attention to a statement made on page 54 of the August 20 issue in which it says:

Army training: If your youngster is debating whether to go from high school into college and take his chances there with the draft, or to get his military service over with first by volunteering, note this:

The Army now is offering a written commitment that a boy who volunteers will get the kind of Army training he wants. He can take an aptitude test in his chosen field before he enlists, and, if he passes, get a letter of acceptance. It will tell him what Army school is holding a place for him and when to enlist to get his basic training over with in time to attend.

Specialist schools: The Army offers schooling in some 80 specialties. After getting through the school of his choice, the volunteer is guaranteed initial Army assignment in his specialty. Thus, if he wants to become, say, a physician or lawyer, he can get training as a medical corpsman or in the Judge Advocate General's department. And, when his service is over, he can use his rights under the GI bill to help finance his college education.

Note, though, he serves 3 years if he volunteers, 2 if drafted.

In order to secure a confirmation of the above statement of policy, I contacted the Office of Army Assignments in the Pentagon and there learned that the above statements are not entirely accurate. While the Army is naturally

Public Law 780 - 83d Congress
Chapter 1264 - 2d Session
H. R. 9859

AN ACT

Authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

River and Harbor
Act of 1954.

SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public, Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

59 Stat. 10.

68 Stat. 1248.

68 Stat. 1249.

Lubec Channel, Maine: Senate Document Numbered 243, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,000;

Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$952,000;

Lynn Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 568, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,000: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash the cost of dredging the easterly three hundred feet of the Municipal Channel to a depth of twenty-two feet, presently estimated to cost \$4,700, before the work is undertaken;

Weymouth Fore River, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 555, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,400,000;

Town River, Quincy, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 108, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,000;

Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 241, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$375,000;

Fall River Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 55, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$694,000;

Bullocks Point Cove, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 242, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,400;

Sakonnet Harbor, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$555,400: *Provided*, That local interests contribute in cash, 4 per centum of the cost of the project, presently estimated as \$23,000;

Patchogue River, Connecticut: House Document Numbered 164, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$135,000;

Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Connecticut: House Document Numbered 488, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$112,500;

Westchester Creek, New York: House Document Numbered 92, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$32,200;

Hudson River, New York: House Document Numbered 228, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$31,928,000;

Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 89, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$138,000;

Hackensack River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 252, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,973,900;

Delaware River, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware: In accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in House Document Numbered 358, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$91,389,000;

Delaware.

Mispillion River, Delaware: Senate Document Numbered 223, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$469,400;

Inland Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland: Senate Document Numbered 123, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,000,000: *Provided*, That the standard of local contribution for the construction of all bridges, including approaches thereto, required by the project shall be the same standard heretofore applied to the construction of St. Georges Bridge;

Maryland.

Queenstown Harbor, Maryland: House Document Numbered 718, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$31,900;

Little Creek, Kent Island, Queen Anne County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 715, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$23,000;

Anchorage at Lowes Wharf, Talbot County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 90, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated

68 Stat. 1249. cost of \$29,000;

68 Stat. 1250. Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 91, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$192,600;

Webster Cove, Somerset County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 619, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$20,300;

Crisfield Harbor, Maryland: House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$101,750: *Provided*, That the cash contribution required of local interests shall be the difference in Federal costs between plans 1 and 2 at the time the project is undertaken;

Rhodes Point to Tylerton, Somerset County, Maryland: House Document Numbered 51, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$45,100;

Pocomoke River, Maryland: House Document Numbered 486, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$678,300;

Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, Maryland: House Document Numbered 444, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$704,000;

Virginia.

Parrotts Creek, Virginia: House Document Numbered 46, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$38,700;

Norfolk Harbor and Thimble Shoal Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,138,700;

Deep Creek, Accomack County, Virginia: House Document Numbered 477, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$95,000;

Oyster Channel, Virginia: Senate Document Numbered 49, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$75,200;

North Carolina. Wallace Channel, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$108,000;

Smiths Creek, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 170, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$102,000;

Channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, and Rollinson Channel, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 411, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$175,000;

Peltier Creek, North Carolina, to Intracoastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 379, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$43,200;

The existing modified project for Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 87, Eighty-first Congress, is hereby further modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon widening of the transition channel at the lower end of the anchorage basin, subsequent to May 17, 1950, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project modification adopted in said Act, provided that such payment shall not exceed the sum of \$65,000;

Charleston Harbor, South Carolina: Senate Document Numbered 136, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$200,000; 64 Stat. 165.

Channel Port Royal Sound to Beaufort, South Carolina: House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$765,000;

Savannah Harbor, Georgia: House Document Numbered 110, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$414,900; Georgia.

Rice Creek, Putnam County, Florida: House Document Numbered 446, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$82,200; Florida.
68 Stat. 1250.

Hillsboro River, Florida: House Document Numbered 567, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$16,600; 68 Stat. 1251.

Carrabelle Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 451, Eighty-third Congress (maintenance of existing channel);

Apalachicola Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 156, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$98,000;

Apalachicola Bay, Florida, channel across St. George Island: House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$635,700;

St. Joseph Bay, Florida: House Document Numbered 595, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,312,000;

Mobile Harbor, Alabama: House Document Numbered 74, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,778,000; Alabama.

Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama: House Document Numbered 394, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$70,000;

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: Modification of existing project in accordance with plans on file in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$877,000; Mississippi.

Bayou Segnette Waterway, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 413, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$520,000; Louisiana.

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: Senate Document Numbered 80, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$6,875,000; Texas.

Guadalupe River at Seadrift, Texas: House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$74,300;

Arañas Pass, Texas, in connection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: House Document Numbered 376, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,700;

Turtle Cove, Texas: House Document Numbered 654, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House Document Numbered 89, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$829,100: *Provided*, That work already performed by local interests on this project, in accordance with recommended plan, may be credited to the cash contribution required of local interests;

Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Texas: House Document Numbered 487, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$180,000;

Missouri.	Mississippi River at Louisiana, Missouri: House Document Numbered 251, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$82,600;
Illinois.	Mississippi River at Chester, Illinois: House Document Numbered 230, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,000;
Minnesota.	Crooked Slough Harbor, Winona, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 347, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$142,000;
Kentucky and Tennessee.	Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee: Senate Document Numbered 81, Eighty-third Congress; and a monetary authorization not to exceed the estimated cost of the Dover and Eureka dams as described in House Document Numbered 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, "Cumberland River and its tributaries, Tennessee and Kentucky", authorized by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby authorized to be expended for partial accomplishment of the project hereby approved: <i>Provided</i> , That such authorization shall include the acquisition of lands necessary for wildlife purposes as outlined in said Senate Document Numbered 81;
60 Stat. 636.	
Kentucky.	Green and Barren Rivers, Kentucky: Senate Document Numbered 82, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,434,000 for channel dredging and fender system work;
Minnesota.	Knife River Harbor, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 463, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$219,900;
Wisconsin.	Cornucopia Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 434, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$220,000;
68 Stat. 1251.	Sheboygan Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 554, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$217,200;
68 Stat. 1252.	
Michigan.	Holland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 282, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$574,400: <i>Provided</i> , That local interests will contribute 25 per centum of the cost of dredging Section B, but not to exceed \$45,500, in addition to the local co-operation required by the project document;
	Crooked and Indian Rivers, Michigan: House Document Numbered 142, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$225,000;
	Saginaw River, Michigan: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated June 7, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,496,800;
Ohio.	Toledo Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 620, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$512,000;
	Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 486, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,900,000;
Pennsylvania.	Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 345, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$174,000;
New York.	Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;
	Little River at Cayuga Island, Niagara Falls, New York: House Document Numbered 246, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$36,900;
	Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 487, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,459,000;
California.	Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California: House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$896,500: <i>Provided</i> , That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon this project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project hereby adopted: <i>Provided further</i> , That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available

therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such payments shall not exceed the sum of \$500,000;

Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, California: House Document Numbered 389, Eighty-third Congress: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the provision of entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and central basin recommended in the project report and presently estimated to cost \$7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof;

Port Hueneme, California: House Document Numbered 362, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,437,000;

Richmond Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 395, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,086,000;

Rogue River, Harbor at Gold Beach, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 83, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,758,700;

Unpqua Harbor and River, Scholfield River at Reedsport, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 133, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,000;

68 Stat. 1252.

68 Stat. 1253.

Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oregon: Senate Document Numbered 128, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,500,000;

Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington: House Document Numbered 249, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$8,555,000;

Oregon and Washington.

Columbia River between Chinook, Washington, and the head of Sand Island: Senate Document Numbered 8, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$227,100;

Willapa River and Harbor and Naselle River, Washington: House Document Numbered 425, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$977,000;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington: House Document Numbered 412, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$421,800;

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River (Westhaven Breakwater), Washington: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated May 27, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$323,700;

Anacortes Harbor, Washington: Senate Document Numbered 102, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$179,300;

Neah Bay, Washington: House Document Numbered 404, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$139,250;

Bellingham Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 558, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,366,650;

Blaine Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 240, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$436,000;

Shilshole Bay, Seattle, Washington: House Document Numbered 536, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,397,300;

Tacoma Harbor, Washington: Modification of existing project to provide for thirty-foot channel in Port Industrial (Wapato) Waterway, in accordance with plans on file in the office of the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of \$634,200;

Port Angeles Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 155, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$477,900;

Everett Harbor and Snohomish River, Washington: House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$395,500;

Quillayute River, Washington: House Document Numbered 579, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$425,550;

Sitka Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$41,500;

Alaska.

Dry Pass, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,419,800;

Neva Strait, Alaska: House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$224,400;

Petersburg Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$40,000;

Pelican Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$270,000;

Ketchikan Harbor, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$2,947,900;

Rocky Pass in Keku Strait, Alaska: In accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated April 8, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$214,000;

Seward Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$81,200;

68 Stat. 1253.

68 Stat. 1254.

Valdez Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 182, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$116,600;

Kodiak Harbor, Alaska: House Document Numbered 465, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,685,000;

Hawaii.

Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: House Document Numbered 717, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,022,000;

Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors, Territory of Hawaii: House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,166,400;

BEACH EROSION

New Hampshire.

Hampton Beach, New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$140,000;

Massachusetts.

Lynn-Nahant Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 134, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$189,000;

Revere Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 146, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$402,900;

Quincy Shore Beach, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 145, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$409,000;

Rhode Island.

South Shore, State of Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 490, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,550;

Connecticut.

Hammonasset River to East River (Area 2), Connecticut: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$166,600 for Hammonasset Beach; \$20,400 for Middle Beach;

New Haven Harbor to Housatonic River (Area 3), Connecticut: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$84,600 for Prospect Beach; \$42,400 for Woodmont Shore; \$13,100 for Gulf Beach; and \$18,300 for Silver Beach to Cedar Beach;

Housatonic River to Ash Creek (Area 7), Connecticut: House Document Numbered 248, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$26,500 for Short Beach; and \$119,000 for Seaside Park;

New Jersey.

Atlantic City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 538, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,044,000;

Ocean City, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 184, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$105,000;

Cold Spring Inlet (Cape May Harbor), New Jersey: House Document Numbered 206, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$260,000;

Virginia.

Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered 186, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$525,514;

Pinellas County, Florida: House Document Numbered 380, Eighty-Florida.
third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$34,300;

Illinois Shore of Lake Michigan: House Document Numbered 28, Illinois.
Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,180,400;

Vermilion to Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Document Num- Ohio.
bered 229, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$185,000;

Cleveland and Lakewood, Ohio: House Document Numbered 502,
Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,275,000 for Edgewater
Park; and \$68,900 for White City Park;

Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pennsylvania: House Document Num- Pennsylvania.
bered 231, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,006,000;

Selkirk Shores State Park, Lake Ontario, New York: House Docu- New York.
ment Numbered 343, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
\$136,500;

Point Mugu to San Pedro Breakwater, California: House Document California.
Numbered 277, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of
\$3,874,000;

Anaheim Bay Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 349,
Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$65,700 for Seal Beach;
and \$91,600 for Surfside;

Carpenteria to Point Mugu, California: House Document Num- 68 Stat. 1254.
bered 29, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$73,700; 68 Stat. 1255.

Waikiki Beach, Territory of Hawaii: House Document Numbered Hawaii.
227, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$283,700.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reim- Reimbursement
burse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion to local inter-
projects authorized in section 101, subsequent to the initiation of the ests, authoriza-
cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, tion.
That the work which may have been done on these projects was
approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the
projects hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement
shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto for funds avail-
able therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects
of higher priority for improvements.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and Preliminary ex-
directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made aminations and
at the following-named localities, and subject to all applicable prov- surveys, authori-
visions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950: ation.

Eastern River, at and in the vicinity of Orland, Maine; 64 Stat. 168.

Southwest Harbor, Maine; Maine.

Vicinity of Wells Beach and Drakes Island, Maine;

Channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Choctawatchee Bay, Florida.
Florida, in the vicinity of Point Washington;

Lake Tarpon (formerly Lake Butler), Florida, to determine
the cause of salt water intrusion and corrective measures with
respect thereto; and

Chipola River, Florida, for measures to maintain satisfactory
water levels in the Dead Lakes;

Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa Forks in Kentucky, West Kentucky, West
Virginia, and Virginia. Causeway.

SEC. 104. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of
Mobile, Alabama, and the State of Alabama, their successors and
assigns, for the closing of Garrows Bend Channel, in the county of
Mobile, Alabama, by the construction and operation of an earth-filled
causeway across said channel in the county of Mobile, in the State of
Alabama: *Provided*, That the work on said causeway shall not be
commenced until the plans and location therefor have been filed with
and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and
by the Secretary of the Army. This provision shall be null and void

unless the actual construction of the causeway hereby authorized is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of this Act and the right to alter, amend, or repeal this provision is hereby expressly reserved.

Intracoastal
Waterway, Fla.

59 Stat. 17;
62 Stat. 1173;
64 Stat. 168.

SEC. 105. The authorization of the improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River (House Document Numbered 371, Seventy-sixth Congress) authorized in the River and Harbor Act of 1945 and modified by the River and Harbor Act of 1948 and the River and Harbor Act of 1950 is further modified so as to authorize the use of alternate route C-1 in the Venice and Lemon Bay, Florida, area, as designated in plans of the Corps of Engineers.

Report to Con-
gress.

The Chief of Engineers is directed to report to the Congress prior to request for appropriation to construct this part of the project his recommendation as to the fair amount of local contribution in the light of the changed condition. Provisions as to local contribution based on these recommendations shall become effective when approved by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mississippi.

68 Stat. 1255.
68 Stat. 1256.

SEC. 106. That the requirement, that local interests provide the ferries and bridges required for land traffic across the lateral and terminal canals, with respect to the river and harbor project authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), on the Pearl River, Mississippi, below Jackson, shall hereafter be ineffective: *Provided*, That local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will hold and save the United States free from any claim for damage which might result from deprivation of access to the area.

Short title.

SEC. 107. Title I may be cited as the "River and Harbor Act of 1954".

Flood Control
Act of 1954.
49 Stat. 1571;
52 Stat. 1215.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 201. That section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public, Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public, Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood-control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

58 Stat. 887.

SEC. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public, Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the following provisions shall be observed:

No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

That the plan for the control of floods in the Connecticut River Basin, approved by the Act of June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended and supplemented, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, of a flood control reservoir on Otter Brook at South Keene, New Hampshire, in lieu of any reservoir or reservoirs heretofore authorized.

68 Stat. 1256.
68 Stat. 1257.

49 Stat. 1572.

That the plan for the West River Basin of the Connecticut River in Vermont is hereby modified to consist of three reservoirs at the Ball Mountain, The Island, and Townshend sites, in lieu of the plan of eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, in general accordance with the plan agreed to by the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers, and the Vermont State Water Conservation Board in June 1950; and the conditions specified in the plan of the eight reservoirs authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, shall not apply.

58 Stat. 891.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

The project for the Susquehanna River in the vicinity of Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 500, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,469,000.

The plan for flood protection on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania and New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 25, 1954, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$25,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

Appropriation.

CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA

The authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida given by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include the entire comprehensive plan of improvement as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Num-

62 Stat. 1175.

bered 643, Eightieth Congress, with such modifications thereof as the Congress may hereafter authorize, or as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable: *Provided*, That the conditions of local cooperation for the authorized first phase heretofore approved by said flood control Act shall apply to that authorized first phase, but for all work over and beyond that previous authorization such conditions shall apply on an interim basis only until they shall be modified as deemed appropriate by the Congress, based on recommendations to be submitted at the earliest practicable date by the Chief of Engineers, through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress: *Provided further*, That whatever conditions of local cooperation are established by Congress as the result of such recommendations shall be retroactive to any units of the comprehensive plan authorized in this Act which may be started prior to establishment of the exact conditions of local cooperation: *And provided further*, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$7,000,000 for partial accomplishment of said plan.

Appropriation.

LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

45 Stat. 534. The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928, as amended and
63 Stat. 1257. modified, is hereby further modified and expanded to include the
68 Stat. 1258. following items of work and the authorization for said project is increased accordingly.

(a) Control of Old and Atchafalaya Rivers and a lock for navigation substantially as set forth in section XIII of the report of the Mississippi River Commission dated February 2, 1954, and the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-third Congress, with such modifications as the Chief of Engineers in his discretion may find advisable at an estimated additional cost (exclusive of the navigation lock) of \$32,000,000, in addition to the \$15,000,000 increase in authorization made by subparagraph (a) under the title "Lower Mississippi River" in section 204 of the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950, which \$15,000,000 shall be applied to the item described in this paragraph: *Provided*, That the United States shall acquire such lands, rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas as may be necessary for construction of the project except that local interests shall comply with the provisions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended, with regard to the enlargement and extension of the main line Mississippi River levee below Shaw, Louisiana: *Provided further*, That no flowage rights are to be acquired by the United States in connection with this item: *And provided further*, That when the type and dimensions of the required navigation lock are approved by the Chief of Engineers, construction thereof may be initiated with funds herein authorized to be appropriated.

64 Stat. 170.

45 Stat. 535.

(b) The plan for an adequate channel from the Mississippi River via Old and Atchafalaya Rivers to Morgan City, Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 53, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$440,000.

(c) Modification of the authorized project for the Vicksburg-Yazoo area substantially in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 85, Eighty-third Congress.

(d) Modification of the authorized project for the New Madrid Floodway substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 183, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,743,000.

(e) The plan for flood control in the Reelfoot Lake Area, Tennessee and Kentucky, substantially in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 17, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$748,100.

TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

The project for the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated May 28, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$4,969,000.

BUFFALO BAYOU BASIN, TEXAS

The project for Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, to provide flood protection for the city of Houston, Texas, as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939, and previous Acts, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 250, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$16,191,600.

53 Stat. 1414.

68 Stat. 1258.

68 Stat. 1259.

BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

The plan for flood protection and other purposes on the Brazos River and tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 535, Eighty-first Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$40,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that plan.

Appropriation.

The project for the Belton Reservoir, Leon River, Texas, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, is hereby modified to provide for the reservation, without reimbursement, of twelve thousand acre-feet of conservation storage to be used as a permanent source of water supply for Fort Hood and adjacent military installations.

60 Stat. 649.

GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TEXAS

The project for flood protection on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 344, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$30,254,000.

GUADALUPE RIVER, TEXAS

The works of improvement on Guadalupe River, Texas, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 17), insofar as such authorization provides for construction of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir, is hereby modified to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be constructed with a gross reservoir capacity of approximately seven hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet (of which three hundred and eighty thousand acre-feet shall be for flood control and sedimentation) for purposes of flood control, conservation, stream-flow regulation, and provision for sedimentation, and, if practicable, for purposes of development of electric power, at an estimated total cost of \$13,300,000.

59 Stat. 18.

Allocation of
costs.

The Chief of Engineers, in consultation with the Federal Power Commission, shall at appropriate times allocate to local interests such of the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir as may appropriately be allocated to water conservation, stream-flow regulation, and development of electric power. Such allocation shall be made in accordance with the separable costs-remaining benefits method, taking into account the net increase in regulated flow which is practical with the storage capacity which will be provided by the Canyon Dam and Reservoir for water conservation and stream-flow regulation. No allocation of costs with respect to any installation for development of electric power shall be made under this section unless the Chief of Engineers determines that such installation will actually be constructed.

The costs allocated to local interests under this section shall be not less than \$1,400,000, and shall be paid by them to the Chief of Engineers as provided in this Act. The portion of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to operation and maintenance of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for maintenance and operation of such dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for such operation and maintenance; the \$1,400,000 to be contributed during the construction period shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation available for construction of the dam and used by the Chief of Engineers for that purpose; and the balance of such costs determined by the Chief of Engineers to be allocable to construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Facilities for the development of electric power at Canyon Dam and Reservoir may be constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, or by local interests in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Power Act and in accordance with this Act, with all expenses of construction, operation, and maintenance of such facilities to be paid by local interests and with such power to be made available to such local interests.

Of the contributions to be paid by local interests toward the cost of construction of Canyon Dam and Reservoir, \$1,400,000 shall be paid in such manner, and, at such time or times during the period of such construction, as the Chief of Engineers shall determine. The remainder of the contributions allocated to local interests, with interest thereon at the rate of 2½ per centum per annum, shall be paid as prescribed by the Chief of Engineers over a period not in excess of fifty years.

The Chief of Engineers shall enter into an agreement with local interests providing for the payments heretofore described and for all other matters relating to the operation and maintenance of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir which require the cooperation of local interests. Such agreement may provide for utilization of the water impounded for water conservation and stream-flow regulation for development of electric power; except that the agreement shall provide that the utilization of water for power development shall not be allowed to conflict with the flood-control and sedimentation purposes of the Canyon Dam and Reservoir.

PECOS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Pecos River, Texas and New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated March 26, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$9,540,000: *Provided*, That no appropriations shall be made for construction of

68 Stat. 1259.

68 Stat. 1260.

41 Stat. 1063;

49 Stat. 863.

16 USC 791a.

Los Esteros Reservoir until satisfactory arrangements have been made by the State of New Mexico for the transfer of irrigation storage from the Alamagordo Reservoir.

RIO GRANDE BASIN

The project for flood protection in the Rio Grande Basin at Albuquerque, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,500,000.

The project for flood protection on the Rio Hondo River at Roswell, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 436, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$5,658,000.

WHITE RIVER BASIN

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, is hereby modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greers Ferry Reservoir and the addition of Beaver Reservoir for flood control, power generation, and other purposes, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated February 19, 1954.

52 Stat. 1218.

68 Stat. 1260.

68 Stat. 1261.

ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River and tributaries at Enid, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$965,000.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Conway County Drainage and Levee District Numbered 1, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 167, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$230,600.

The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River, Holla Bend Bottom, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 157, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$12,000.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River in urban areas at Alton, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 397, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$2,500,000.

The project for flood protection on Bear Creek at Hannibal, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,326,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Guttenberg, Iowa, to Hamburg Bay, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 281, Eighty-third Congress, excepting only the improvements recommended for Credit Island and

for Henderson County Drainage District No. 3, at an estimated cost for improvements authorized of \$30,551,000.

The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River, Fish Lake Drainage and Levee District No. 8, Monroe County, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 396, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$480,000.

The project on the Mississippi River for local flood protection in the Sny Island Levee Drainage District, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 247, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$7,046,300.

The project for flood protection on the Upper Iowa River, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 375, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$979,600.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$144,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers, approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

Appropriation.
52 Stat. 1218.
68 Stat. 1261.
68 Stat. 1262.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Kansas River and tributaries, Colorado, Nebraska and Kansas substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 642, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated additional cost of \$73,710,000, and there is authorized to be appropriated such sum in addition to previous authorizations for the Missouri Basin plan.

Appropriation.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, approved by the Act of June 28, 1938, and as amended and supplemented, is hereby further modified to include the project for flood protection on the Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 549, Eighty-first Congress.

49 Stat. 1588.

58 Stat. 897.

The project adopted by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, to provide flood protection for the Kansas Citys, Kansas and Missouri, as modified and extended by the Flood Control Act of December 29, 1944, is hereby further modified to provide that the Chief of Engineers may contribute not to exceed \$2,750,000 to the cost of an alternate plan of flood protection to be constructed by local interests in the lower Armourdale area of the Kansas Citys project: *Provided*, That the actual amount so paid by the Federal Government shall not exceed the estimated Federal cost of the approved Government plan of protection in this area nor shall it exceed the total actual costs of the alternate project reduced by the estimated costs for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and public relocations which local interests would have been required to bear had the approved Government plan been constructed: *Provided further*, That the total amount shall be paid in installments during progress of the work to satisfactory completion of the alternate plan.

The project for flood protection on the Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$19,612,000.

The project for flood protection on the Big Sioux River and tributaries at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report dated March 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$3,430,000.

The project for flood protection on the Little Sioux River, Iowa, authorized by the Act of August 4, 1947, is hereby modified and supplemented substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-third Congress, at an additional estimated cost of \$10,076,000. 61 Stat. 741.

The general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House Document Numbered 475 and Senate Document Numbered 191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document Numbered 247, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers for construction or provision of adequate water supply and sewage facilities in the new relocated municipality of Pollock, South Dakota, at a cost not to exceed \$200,000, which is to compensate for the acquisition of and to replace facilities in the town which are located within areas which have been or will be acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project in the basin. 58 Stat. 897. 68 Stat. 1262. 68 Stat. 1263.

The project for flood protection on the Little Missouri River and tributaries at Marmarth, North Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 134, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$212,300.

The project for flood protection on the Lower Heart River in the vicinity of Mandan, North Dakota, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated July 27, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$1,727,000. 60 Stat. 648; 64 Stat. 175.

COAL CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, TENNESSEE

The project for flood protection on Coal Creek and tributaries, Tennessee, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 154, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$745,200.

OHIO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Sandy Lick Creek at and in the vicinity of Reynoldsville, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 716, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$570,000.

The project for flood control and related purposes on the Paint Rock River, Alabama, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated June 23, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$1,001,300: *Provided*, That in lieu of the local cooperation recommended in that document, local interests shall comply with the provisions of local cooperation contained in section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, and shall also construct and maintain local drainage works required to fully and effectively utilize the improved outlet system, generally as outlined in said document. 49 Stat. 1571.

KALAMAZOO RIVER, MICHIGAN

The project for flood protection on the Kalamazoo River at Battle Creek, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$4,201,550: *Provided*, That local contribution toward the project will be in accord with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Army contained in the aforesaid document.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, INDIANA

The project for flood protection on the Little Calumet River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 153, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$509,900.

LOS ANGELES RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$12,500,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin, and Ballona Creek, California, approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

68 Stat. 1263.

68 Stat. 1264.

SANTA MARIA RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Santa Maria River and tributaries, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 400, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$10,182,000 for levees and channel improvements to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

SAN LORENZO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 447, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$2,665,000.

SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Middle Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,110,000.

The plan of improvement for flood control on the American River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$1,600,000 for levees.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Lower San Joaquin River Basin, California, approved in the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

Appropriation.

58 Stat. 901.

SAN LORENZO CREEK BASIN

The project for flood protection on San Lorenzo Creek, Alameda County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 452, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$3,790,000.

TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

The project for flood protection on Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of \$791,000: *Provided*, That the authorization for improvement for flood control on Truckee River, California and Nevada, contained herein shall not become effective unless and until the "Washoe Reclamation Project" on the Truckee and Carson Rivers, California and Nevada, shall have been authorized pursuant to law.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$180,000,000 for the prosecution of the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, for which the sum of \$75,000,000 was authorized in the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950, and these projects and plans are hereby modified to include power development in the following projects in tributary basins, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress: Cougar Reservoir on South Fork of McKenzie River, Oregon, and Green Peter Reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon, including White Bridge reregulating reservoir on Middle Fork of Santiam River, Oregon.

Appropriation.

64 Stat. 178.

68 Stat. 1264.

68 Stat. 1265.

The project for flood protection on Amazon Creek at Eugene and vicinity, Oregon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, and modified by the Flood Control Act of 1950, is further modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 131, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of \$893,600.

60 Stat. 650.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The project for flood protection on Gold Creek and tributaries, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 54, Eighty-second Congress, at an estimated cost of \$380,000.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The project for flood protection on the Wailoa Stream and its tributaries, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 529, Eighty-first Congress, at an estimated cost of \$347,000.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its Territorial possessions, Preliminary examinations and surveys, authorization.

which include the following-named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any examination, survey, project, or work underway or proposed are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or stream mentioned in this section until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Ipswich River, Massachusetts.

Neponset River, Massachusetts.

Ash and Pine Creeks, Fairfield and vicinity, Connecticut.

Juniata River at Lewistown and other points in Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control.

Streams in the vicinity of Alice, Texas.

Devils River and tributaries, Texas.

Rio Hondo and tributaries, New Mexico.

Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California.

Coos Bay, Oregon.

Appropriation.

68 Stat. 1265.

68 Stat. 1266.

58 Stat. 887.

55 Stat. 650;

60 Stat. 642;

67 Stat. 61.

SEC. 205. In addition to previous authorizations, the sum of \$20,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Department of Agriculture for the prosecution of the works of improvement authorized to be carried out by that Department by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, as amended.

SEC. 206. That section 7 of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public, Numbered 228, Seventy-seventh Congress), as amended by section 5 of the Act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), as further amended by the Act approved June 16, 1953 (Public, Numbered 60, Eighty-third Congress), is hereby still further amended to read as follows:

"That 75 per centum of all moneys received and deposited in the Treasury of the United States during any fiscal year on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood control, navigation, and allied purposes, including the development of hydroelectric power, shall be paid at the end of such year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State in which such property is situated, to be expended as the State legislature may prescribe for the benefit of public schools and public roads of the county, or counties, in which such property is situated, or for defraying any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements: *Provided*, That when such property is situated in more than one State or county, the distributive share to each from the proceeds of such property shall be proportional to its area therein."

52 Stat. 1226.

SEC. 207. That section 8 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized an expenditure as required, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes by the United States, for the establishment, operation, and maintenance by the Weather Bureau of a network of recording and nonrecording precipitation stations, known as the Hydroclimatic Network, whenever in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers and the Chief of the Weather Bureau such service

is advisable in connection with either preliminary examinations and surveys or works of improvement authorized by the law for flood control, rivers and harbors, and related purposes, and the Secretary of the Army upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers is authorized to allot the Weather Bureau funds for said expenditure."

SEC. 208. That section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937, as amended by section 13 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

50 Stat. 877;
60 Stat. 652.

"That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot not to exceed \$2,000,000 from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for any one fiscal year for flood control, for removing accumulated snags and other debris, and clearing and straightening the channel in navigable streams and tributaries thereof, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is advisable in the interest of flood control: *Provided*, That not more than \$100,000 shall be expended for this purpose for any single tributary from the appropriations for any one fiscal year."

Removal of
debris, etc.

SEC. 209. That section 4 of the Act approved July 24, 1946 (Public, Numbered 526, Seventy-ninth Congress), is amended to read as follows:

60 Stat. 642.

"The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities in reservoir areas under the control of the Department of the Army, and to permit the construction, maintenance, and operation of such facilities. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other

Recreational
facilities in
reservoir areas.

68 Stat. 1266.
68 Stat. 1267.

tural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such reservoirs shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such water areas along the shores of such reservoirs shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secre-

All 68 Stat. 1267.

tary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Short title.

SEC. 210. Title II may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1954".

Approved September 3, 1954.

U.S.D.A.
SEA/113
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250

